US ERA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

## TEXT SEARCHABLE DOCUMENT

Data Evaluation Report on the Acute Toxicity of AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 to Terrestrial Vascular Plants: Vegetative Vigor

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

EPA MRID Number 468019-27

Data Requirement:

PMRA Data Code:

9.8.4 (TGAI) or 9.8.6 (EP)

EPA DP Barcode:

D328639

**OECD Data Point:** 

IIA 8.12 (TGAI) and IIIA 10.8.1.1 (EP)

**EPA Guideline**:

123-1b

Test material:

AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102

Purity: 4.53% w/w

Common name: AE 0317309 (Pyrasulfotole)

Chemical name: IUPAC: 5-hydroxy-1,3-dimethylpyrazol-4-yl(2-mesyl-4-trifluoromethylphenyl)methanone

CAS name: Not reported CAS No.: Not reported Synonyms: Not reported

Primary Reviewer: John Marton

Signature:

Staff Scientist, Cambridge Environmental Inc.

**Date:** 5/11/06

Secondary Reviewer: Teri S. Myers

Senior Scientist, Cambridge Environmental Inc.

Signature: Date: 5/27/06 Den's Mynn
Thelly

Primary Reviewer: Melissa Panger

Date: 9/29/06

**EPA** 

Secondary Reviewer: David McAdam

Secondary Reviewer: J.D. Whall (Officer No. 1268)

**Date:** 11/17/06

**PMRA** 

Date: 9 Nov 2006

Australian Gvernment Department of the Environment and Heritage (DEH)

Reference/Submission No.: {......

**Company Code** 

**BCZ** 

**Active Code Use Site Category:** 

**PSA** 13, 14

**EPA PC Code** 

000692

Date Evaluation Completed: 12-01-2006

CITATION: Pallet, K. and H. Gosch. 2006. Non-target terrestrial plants: Vegetative vigor test (Tier 2) AE 0317309 + Mefenpyr di-ethyl (AE F107892); Suspo-emulsion: 50+12.5 g/L (Code: AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102). Unpublished study performed by Bayer CropScience GmbH, Ecotoxicology, Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Laboratory report number VV04/005. Study sponsored by Bayer CropScience GmbH, Ecotoxicology, Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Study complete on January 10, 2006.

**DISCLAIMER:** This document provides guidance for EPA and PMRA reviewers on how to complete a data evaluation record after reviewing a scientific study concerning the acute toxicity of a pesticide to terrestrial vascular plants. It is not intended to prescribe conditions to any external party for conducting this study nor to establish absolute criteria regarding the assessment of whether the study is scientifically sound and whether the study satisfies any applicable data requirements. Reviewers are expected to review and to determine for each study, on a case-bycase basis, whether it is scientifically sound and provides sufficient information to satisfy applicable data

2065161

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

requirements. Studies that fail to meet any of the conditions may be accepted, if appropriate; similarly, studies that meet all of the conditions may be rejected, if appropriate. In sum, the reviewer is to take into account the totality of factors related to the test methodology and results in determining the acceptability of the study.

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: **EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

The effect of AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 (formulation containing the active ingredient AE 0317309; pyrasulfotole) on the vegetative vigor of monocot (corn, Zea mays; oat, Avena sativa; barley, Hordeum vulgare; ryegrass, Lolium perenne) and dicot (cucumber, Cucumis sativus; oilseed rape, Brassica napus; soybean, Glycine max; sugar beet, Beta vulgaris; sunflower, Helianthus annuus; tomato, Lycopersicon esculentum) crops was studied at varying nominal application rates. AE 0317309 02 SE06 A 102 is proposed for use on selected cereal crops at a one time application rate 1 L product/ha (or, 50 g a.i./ha). Ryegrass and oat were treated with nominal application rates of 0 (negative control), 0.00622, 0.0125, 0.0249, 0.0498 and 0.0994 lbs ai/A (or, 0, 7.1, 14.2, 28.3, 56.6 and 113 g a.i./ha). Onion and corn were treated with nominal application rates of 0 (negative control), 0.00311, 0.00622, 0.0125, 0.0249, 0.0498 and 0.0994 lbs ai/A (or, 0, 3.5, 7.1, 14.2, 28.3, 56.6 and 113 g a.i./ha). Cucumber, sunflower, soybean, oilseed rape, sugar beet and tomato were treated with nominal application rates of 0 (negative control), 0.000199, 0.000399, 0.000797, 0.00156, 0.00311 and 0.00622 lbs ai/A (or, 0, 0.23, 0.45, 0.89, 1.8, 3.5 and 7.1 g a.i./ha). Measured concentrations in the highest treatment rate were 95.7% of nominal values. The growth medium used in the vegetative vigor test was natural soil classified as a silty loam with a pH of 7.4 and an organic carbon content of 1.19%. On Day 21 the surviving plants per pot were recorded and cut at soil level for measuring the plant height and dry weight. Plant height results could not be statistically verified by the reviewer because appropriate replicate data were not provided.

With the exception of ryegrass, the plant dry weight was significantly affected by AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 treatment in all species. The most sensitive monocot species, based on dry weight, in the vegetative vigor test was onion with an  $EC_{25}$  of 0.017 lbs ai/A and a NOAEC of 0.0125 lbs ai/A. The most sensitive dicot species, based on dry weight, was tomato with an  $EC_{25}$  of 0.00081 lbs ai/A and a NOAEC 0.000797 lbs ai/A.

Observed phytotoxic effects included bleaching, chlorosis, necrosis and growth suspension. At test termination all species were observed with phytotoxic symptoms, with the exception of ryegrass, which had recovered from the effects observed on Day 7.

Maximum Labeled Rate: Not reported

#### **Results Synopsis**

#### Monocot

#### Monocot

 $EC_{05}/IC_{05}$ : 0.0041 lbs ai/A (4.6 g a.i./ha)  $EC_{25}/IC_{25}$ : 0.017 lbs ai/A (19.1 g a.i./ha)

EC<sub>50</sub>/IC<sub>50</sub>: 0.044 lbs ai/A (49.3 g a.i./ha) NOAEC: 0.0125 (14.2 g a.i./ha)

Slope: 1.59 Std err: 0.381

Most sensitive monocot: Onion Most sensitive parameter: Dry Weight 95% C.I.: 0.0010-0.016 lbs ai/A (1.1 – 17.9 g a.i./ha) 95% C.I.: 0.0078-0.036 lbs ai/A (8.7 – 40.4 g a.i./ha) 95% C.I.: 0.029-0.068 (32.5 – 76.2 g a.i./ha)

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

**Dicot** 

EC<sub>05</sub>/IC<sub>05</sub>: 0.00023 lbs ai/A EC25/IC25: 0.00081 lbs ai/A

(0.26 g a.i./ha)(0.91 g a.i./ha) 95% C.I.:  $4.3E^{-05}$ -0.0012 lbs ai/A (0.048 – 1.35 g a.i./ha) 95% C.I.: 0.00029-0.0022 lbs ai/A (0.33 – 2.5 g a.i./ha)

EC<sub>50</sub>/IC<sub>50</sub>: 0.0019 lbs ai/A NOAEC: 0.000797 lbs ai/A (2.1 g a.i./ha) (0.89 g a.i./ha) 95% C.I.: 0.0010-0.0036 lbs ai/A (1.1-4.0 g a.i./ha)

Slope: 1.78

Std err: 0.503

Most sensitive dicot: Tomato

Most sensitive parameter: Dry Weight

This toxicity study is classified as SUPPLEMENTAL to the US EPA and ACCEPTABLE to the PMRA and DEH and does satisfy the guideline requirement for a Tier II terrestrial plant vegetative vigor toxicity study.

Table 1a. Summary of most sensitive parameters by species (lbs ai/A).

Species	Endpoint	NOAEC	EC <sub>05</sub>	EC <sub>25</sub>	EC <sub>50</sub>
Monocots					
Com	Dry Weight	0.0249	0.020	0.042	0.072
Oat	Dry Weight	0.0249	0.015	0.050	>0.0944
Onion	Dry Weight	0.0125	0.0041	0.017	0.044
Ryegrass	Dry Weight	0.0944	ND	>0.0944	>0.0944
Dicots					
Cucumber	Dry Weight	0.000797	0.00066	0.0029	>0.00622
Oilseed rape	Dry Weight	0.000797	0.00068	0.0015	0.0027
Soybean	Dry Weight	0.000797	0.00056	0.0016	0.0034
Sugar beet	Dry Weight	0.000399	0.00049	0.0011	0.0020
Sunflower	Dry Weight	0.00156	0.0017	0.0029	0.0040
Tomato	Dry Weight	0.000797	0.00023	0.00081	0.0019

Table 1b. Summary of most sensitive parameters by species (g a.i./ha).

Species	Endpoint	NOAEC	EC <sub>05</sub>	EC <sub>25</sub>	EC <sub>50</sub>
Monocots					
Corn	Dry Weight	28.3	22.4	47.1	80.7
Oat	Dry Weight	28.3	16.8	56.0	>113
Onion	Dry Weight	14.2	4.6	19.1	49.3
Ryegrass	Dry Weight	113	ND	>113	>113
Dicots					
Cucumber	Dry Weight	0.89	0.74	3.3	>7.1
Oilseed rape	Dry Weight	0.89	0.76	1.7	3.0
Soybean	Dry Weight	0.89	0.62	1.8	3.8
Sugar beet	Dry Weight	0.45	0.55	1.2	2.2
Sunflower	Dry Weight	1.8	1.9	3.3	4.5
Tomato	Dry Weight	0.89	0.26	0.91	2.1

#### I. MATERIALS AND METHODS

**GUIDELINE FOLLOWED:** 

The study followed guidelines outlined in US EPA Pesticide Assessment Guidelines, Sub-division J, Hazard Evaluation, Non-Target Plants, PB83-

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

153940, EPA540/9-82-020, Series 123, Tier 2 of Non-Target Area Testing and OECD, Guideline for the testing of chemicals, Guideline 208, Terrestrial (Non-Target) Plant Test, 208 A, Seedling Emergence and Seedling Growth Test and 208 B, Vegetative Vigor test. The following deviations were noted:

- 1. The maximum label rate of the test material was not reported.
- 2. The physiochemical properties of the test material were not reported.
- 3. Mean-measured concentrations were not determined. Only the highest application rate was measured for the presence of the active ingredient (AE 0317309).
- 4. The reviewer was unable to statistically analyze plant height because the study authors only reported the range of values within each replicate and the treatment mean; no replicate mean values were reported.
- 5. The LOQ and LOD were not reported.
- 6. The geographic location, CEC and moisture content at 1/3 atmospheres were not reported.
- 7. All species were tested under the same environmental conditions instead of testing cold-preferring species separately from warm-preferring species.
- 8. Pots were initially top watered to facilitate germination and establish the water column (prior to being treated). Thereafter, water was applied via subirrigation by adding water to saucers below the pots.
- 9. Glasshouse environmental control was set at 23±5°C day and 15±5°C night. Minor deviations up to 36°C and down to 10°C occurred for short periods of time and the study authors did not feel that this deleteriously impacted plant growth. The same occurred with relative humidity which ranged from 20 to 100%.

The deviations did impact the acceptability of the study for the US EPA.

**COMPLIANCE:** 

Signed and dated No Data Confidentiality, GLP and Quality Assurance statements were provided. This study was performed in compliance with the Principles of Good Laboratory Practice, Annex 1 to Chemicals Act of Federal Republic of Germany in the current version [Grundätze der Guten Laborpraxis (GLP), Anhang 1 zum Chemikaliengesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in der aktuellen Fassung] based on the OECD Principles of Good Laboratory Practice as revised in 1997 and adopted November 26<sup>th</sup>, 1997 by decision of the OECD Council [C(97)186/Final].

#### A. MATERIALS:

1. Test Material

AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102

**Description:** 

Light Yellow Milky Liquid

Lot No./Batch No.:

35893-VI (Batch Number)

**Purity:** 

4.53% w/w

Stability of compound under test conditions:

Samples of the highest application rate (0.0994 lbs ai/A) were collected and analyzed on Day 0. Percent recoveries were 95.7% of nominal. The other application rates were not analyzed for the presence of the active ingredient AE 0317309. (OECD recommends chemical stability in water and light)

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

Storage conditions of test chemicals:

Stored at 25±5°C

Table 2. Physical/chemical properties of [AE 0317309].

Parameter	Value	Comment
Molecular weight	362.3 g/mol	
Water Solubility (g/L) at 20°C	4.2 at pH 4 69.1 at pH 7 49.0 at pH 9	Very soluble
Vapor Pressure/Volatility	2.7 x 10 <sup>-7</sup> Pa at 20°C 6.8 x 10 <sup>-7</sup> Pa at 25°C	Non-volatile
UV Absorption	water $\lambda_{max} = 264$ 0.1M HCl $\lambda_{max} = 241$ 0.1M NaOH $\lambda_{max} = 216$	Not likely to undergo photolysis.
Pka	$4.2 \pm 0.15$	
log K <sub>ow</sub> at 23°C	0.276 at pH 4 -1.362 at pH 7 -1.58 at pH 9	Not likely to bioaccumulate
Stability of compound at room temperature, if provided		No significant degradation over 12 months at ambient temperatures.

Data obtained from pyrasulfatole chemistry review of Submission 2006-2445.

#### 2. Test organism:

Monocotyledonous species: Corn (Zea mays, Family Poaceae, Lorenzo), Oat (Avena sativa, Family Poaceae, Flämings Nova), Onion (Allium cepa, Family Liliaceae, Zittauer Gelbe) and Ryegrass (Lolium perenne, Family Poaceae, Deutsches Weidegras); EPA recommends four monocots in two families, including corn.

Dicotyledonous species: Cucumber (Cucumis sativus, Family Curcubitaceae, Delikatess), Oilseed rape (Brassica napus, Family Brassicaceae, Liratop), Soybean (Glycine max, Family Fabaceae, Trail), Sugar beet (Beta vulgaris, Family Chenopodiaceae, Achat), Sunflower (Helianthus annuus L., Family Asteraceae, Big Smile) and Tomato (Lycopersicon esculentum, Family Solanaceae, Balkonstar); EPA recommends six dicots in four families, including soybean and a root crop.

OECD recommends a minimum of three species selected for testing, at least one from each of the following categories: Category 1: ryegrass, rice, oat, wheat, and sorghum; Category 2: mustard, rape, radish, turnip, and Chinese cabbage; Category 3: vetch, mung bean, red clover, fenugreek, lettuce, and cress.

Seed source: Seeds were supplied from commercial sources via Bayer CropScience GmbH, Horticulture, H872, 65926 Frankfurt am Main.

Prior seed treatment/sterilization: None

Historical % germination of seed: Germination was not reported; however, the study authors reported that germination tests were conducted to ensure viability of the seeds.

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

Seed storage, if any: Seeds were stored in plastic boxes in the refrigerator

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446 **B. STUDY DESIGN:** 

EPA MRID Number 468019-27

#### 1. Experimental Conditions

- a. Limit test: A limit test was not conducted.
- b. Range-finding study: A range-finding study was not conducted.
- c. Definitive Study

Parameters	Vegetative Vigor		
	Details	Remarks	
		Criteria	
Duration of the test	21 Days	Recommended test duration is 14-21 days.	
Number of seeds/plants replicate	Cucumber, Sunflower and Tomato: 4 plants/rep  Oilseed rape, Soybean, Sugar beet, Corn, Oat, Onion and Ryegrass: 5 plants/rep	Five plants per replicate are recommended.	
Number of plants retained after thinning	The number of plants prior to thinning was not reported. The reported number of plants/rep and reps/level were the numbers retained after thinning.	A total of 40 plants were used in each control and treatment level.	
Number of replicates Control: Adjuvant control: Treated:	Cucumber, Sunflower and Tomato: 10 reps/control and treatment  Oilseed rape, Soybean, Sugar beet, Corn, Oat, Onion and Ryegrass: 8 reps/control and treatment	A solvent control was not used.  Four replicates per dose are recommended	

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

	EPA	<b>MRID</b>	Number	468019-27
--	-----	-------------	--------	-----------

Parameters	Vegetative Vigor			
	Details	Remarks		
		Criteria		
Test concentrations (mg ai/kg soil and g ai/ha) Nominal:	Ryegrass and Oat: 0 (negative control), 0.00622, 0.0125, 0.0249, 0.0498 and 0.0994 lbs ai/A or	Mean-measured concentrations were not determined. Only the highest application rate was measured for the presence of the active ingredient (AE 0317309).		
	0 (negative control), 7.1, 14.2, 28.3, 56.6 and 113 g a.i./ha.	Five test concentrations should be used with a dose range of 2X or 3X progression		
Nominal:	Onion and Corn: 0 (negative control), 0.00311, 0.00622, 0.0125, 0.0249, 0.0498 and 0.0994 lbs ai/A, or			
	0 (negative control), 3.5, 7.1, 14.2, 28.3, 56.6 and 113 g a.i./ha.			
Nominal:	Cucumber, Oilseed rape, Soybean, Sunflower, Sugar beet and Tomato: 0 (negative control), 0.000199, 0.000399, 0.000797, 0.00156, 0.00311 and 0.00622 lbs ai/A, or			
	0 (negative control), 0.23, 0.45, 0.89, 1.8, 3.5 and 7.1 g a.i./ha.			
Measured:	Samples of the highest application rate (0.0994 lbs ai/A) were analyzed and yielded a percent recovery of 95.7% of nominal.			
Method and interval of analytical verification LOQ: LOD:	The highest application rate was analyzed on Day 0 using HPLC. Not reported Not reported			
Adjuvant (type, percentage, if used)	N/A; an adjuvant was not used.			
Test container (pot)	Onion:	Pots were commercial plastic flower pots.		

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

EPA MI	RID Numbe	r 468019-27
		1 マリンフェンニルノー

Parameters	Vegetative Vigor			
	Details	Remarks		
		Criteria		
Size/Volume	10 cm diameter x 9 cm high	Non-porous containers should be used.		
	All Other Species: 13 cm diameter x 10 cm high	OECD recommends that non-porous plastic or glazed pots be used.		
Material: (glass/polystyrene)	Plastic			
Growth facility	On-site greenhouse			
Method/depth of seeding	Seeds were introduced manually introduced into the soil. Seeds were covered by up to 5 mm of soil and top watered immediately to facilitate germination. The size of the seed determined the sowing depth, i.e. 5 mm diameter seeds covered by 5 mm soil and 2 mm diameter seeds covered by 3 mm soil. To reach the 2-4 true leaf stage at the start of testing, sowing was started 16-37 days prior to testing.			
Test material application Application time including the plant growth stage Number of application Application interval	Test material was applied to all plants at the 2-4 true leaf stage.  1 N/A; single application			
Method of application	Spray booth equipped with a laboratory track sprayer			
Details of soil used Geographic location Depth of soil collection Soil texture % sand	Not reported 2 mm Silty loam 14.2%	Soil was obtained from Bayer CropScience GmbH, Global Biology Herbicides, Horticulture, H 872, Industriepark Hoechst, 65926 Frankfurt am Main.		

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

Vegetative Vigor			
Details	Remarks		
	Criteria		
65.1% 20.7% 7.4 1.19% Not reported Not reported	EPA prefers soil mixes containing sandy loam, loam, or clay loam soil with no greater than 2% organic matter. Glass beads, rock wool, and 100% acid washed sand are not preferred  OECD prefers the soil to be sieved (0.5 cm) to remove coarse fragments. Carbon content should not exceed 1.5% (3% organic matter). Fine particles (under 20um) makeup should be between 10 and 20%. The recommended pH is between 5.0 and 7.5.		
A solution of 0.1% liquid fertilizer (Wurax super) was given April 30 and May 05, 2004.			
Local tap water As needed At least once per day Pots were initially top watered to facilitate germination and establish the water column. Thereafter, water was applied via subirrigation by adding water to saucers below the pots.	EPA prefers that under foliage watering or bottom watering be utilized for vegetative vigor studies so that the chemical is not washed out of the soil during the test.		
Soil was sterilized via 120 degrees of vapor for about 30 minutes. The soil received 2.4 g/L of granular fertilizer (Blauforn) prior to sowing.	No pest control was reported.		
10-36°C 16L:8D 4076-25880 lux 20-100%	Glasshouse environmental control was set at 23±5°C day and 15±5°C night. Minor deviations up to 36°C and down to 10°C occurred for short periods of time and the study authors did not feel that this deleteriously impacted plant growth.  Natural day light was supplemented by artificial lighting to provide the required photoperiod. Regulation of light intensity		
	Details  65.1% 20.7% 7.4 1.19% Not reported Not reported Not reported  A solution of 0.1% liquid fertilizer (Wurax super) was given April 30 and May 05, 2004.  Local tap water As needed At least once per day Pots were initially top watered to facilitate germination and establish the water column. Thereafter, water was applied via subirrigation by adding water to saucers below the pots.  Soil was sterilized via 120 degrees of vapor for about 30 minutes. The soil received 2.4 g/L of granular fertilizer (Blauforn) prior to sowing.  10-36°C 16L:8D 4076-25880 lux		

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

EPA	MRID	Number	468019-2	27

Parameters	Vegetative Vigor		
	Details	Remarks	
		Criteria	
		EPA prefers that the cold vs warm loving plants be tested in two separate groups to optimize plant growth.	
		OECD prefers that the temperature, humidity and light conditions be suitable for maintaining normal growth of each species for the test period.	
Reference chemical (if used) Name: Concentrations:	N/A N/A	A reference chemical was not used.	
Other parameters, if any	None		

#### 2. Observations:

Table 4: Observation Parameters - Vegetative Vigor

Parameters	Ve	getative Vigor
	Details	Remarks
Parameters measured (i.e., plant height, dry weight or other endpoints)	Survival, phytotoxicity, growth stage, plant dry weight and length.	
Measurement technique for each parameter	Survival was determined by visual enumeration. Plant length was determined by measuring the total shoot height (i.e. longest leaf) to the nearest 0.1 cm. Dry weight was determined using a balance and weight to the nearest 0.001 g. Phytotoxicity was determined using a numerical rating system.	
Observation intervals	Survival and phytotoxicity were determined weekly. Dry weight, plant height and growth stage were determined at test termination (Day 21).	
Other observations, if any	None	

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

LIA MILL MUMBEL TOUCH	EP	A MRID Numb	er 468019-27
-----------------------	----	-------------	--------------

Were raw data included?	Raw data for survival, dry weight and phytotoxicity were included. While replicate data for shoot length were provided, values represented a range, rather than a replicate mean; individual shoot length data were not provided to calculate replicate means.	
Phytotoxicity rating system, if used	Phytotoxicity was described using a percentage, which reflected the extent of the symptom. 0%- no injury or effect; 10-20%- slight symptoms throughout the whole plant or more moderate symptoms on a small area; 30-40%- moderate symptoms throughout the whole plant or severe symptoms on a limited area; 50-60%- severe symptoms throughout the whole plant with younger or newly developed leaves growing normally; 70-80%-total plant symptoms with the plant showing poor vigor; 90%- moribund or dying plant	Any plant considered dead was not rated for phytotoxicity.

#### **II. RESULTS and DISCUSSION:**

#### A. INHIBITORY EFFECTS:

#### Vegetative Vigor:

Ryegrass was the only species which did not exhibit significant reductions relative to the negative control for any of the endpoints analyzed (survival, plant height and biomass). Onion, sugar beet and tomato were the only species that exhibited reductions of  $\geq 25\%$  in percent survival, relative to the negative control. All dicot species and onion (a monocot) exhibited reductions of  $\geq 25\%$  in plant height, relative to the negative control. Ryegrass was the only species that did not exhibit a reduction of  $\geq 25\%$  in dry weight, relative to the negative control. All other species exhibited a reduction of  $\geq 25\%$  in dry weight, however, cucumber was the only species, with the exception of ryegrass, in which the reduction was <25%. All observed effects appeared to be dose-dependent, although not always in a linear fashion. The most sensitive monocot, based on dry weight, was onion with NOAEC and EC<sub>25</sub> values of 0.0125 and 0.0254 lbs ai/A, respectively. The most sensitive dicot, based on dry weight, was tomato with NOAEC and EC<sub>25</sub> values of 0.000797 and 0.00108 lbs ai/A, respectively.

No phytotoxic effects were observed in the controls for any of the species tested. By test termination, ryegrass was the only species which was not observed with phytotoxic symptoms. Slight symptoms (10-

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

20%) were observed on Day 7, yet full recovery occurred by Day 14 and persisted throughout the remainder of the test. Symptoms were observed in the two highest treatment levels for oat on Day 7 (0.0498 and 0.0994 lbs ai/A), but by test termination, plants in the 0.0498 lbs ai/A treatment level had fully recovered and the severity of the effects in the 0.0994 lbs ai/A decreased from 30-40% on Day 7 to 10-20% on Day 21. All other species exhibited symptoms in two or more treatment levels and a dose-dependent relationship was apparent in that the severity and frequency of symptoms increased with application rate. Observed phytotoxic effects included bleaching, chlorosis, necrosis and growth suspension. Phytotoxicity was described using a percentage, which reflected the extent of the symptom. 0%- no injury or effect; 10-20%- slight symptoms throughout the whole plant or more moderate symptoms on a small area; 30-40%-moderate symptoms throughout the whole plant or severe symptoms on a limited area; 50-60%- severe symptoms throughout the whole plant with younger or newly developed leaves growing normally; 70-80%-total plant symptoms with the plant showing poor vigor; 90%- moribund or dying plant.

#### **B. REPORTED STATISTICS:**

The data from all treatment levels was compared to each species' respective negative control. Mortality and dry weight were compared using the ToxRat software for statistical analysis (version 2.09). The study authors did not report analyzing plant height; however, NOAEC and ECx values for plant height were provided by the study authors.

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

## EPA MRID Number 468019-27

Table 5: Reported effect of AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 on Vegetative Vigor

Species	Results summ	ary for bioma	ss (lbs ai/A)							
	Dry weight (g)*	NOAEC	EC <sub>05</sub>	95%CI	EC <sub>25</sub>	95%CI	EC <sub>50</sub>	95%CI	slope	std err
Corn	1.620-4.450	0.0249	NR	NR .	0.0396	0.0207-0.0523	0.0694	0.0526-ND	NR	NR
Oat	1.279-2.309	0.0249	NR	NR	0.0506	0.0420-0.0587	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Onion	0.022-0.063	0.0125	NR	NR	0.0254	0.00474-0.0423	0.0625	0.0368-ND	NR	NR
Ryegrass	0.559-0.751	0.0994	NR	NR	>0.0994	N/A	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Cucumber	1.835-3.452	0.00311	NR	NR	>0.00622	N/A	>0.00622	N/A	NR	NR
Oilseed Rape	0.626-3.698	0.000797	NR	NR	0.00151	0.00124-0.00175	0.00267	0.00235-0.00303	NR	NR
Soybean	0.621-2.054	0.000797	NR	NR	0.00171	0.00144-0.00195	0.00347	0.00307-0.00395	NR	NR
Sugar beet	0.218-2.209	0.000399	NR	NR	0.00124	0.00112-0.00132	0.00207	0.00199-0.00219	NR	NR
Sunflower	0.252-1.273	0.00156	NR	NR	0.00291	0.00271-0.00307	0.00407	0.00387-0.00427	NR ·	NR
Tomato	0.149-1.061	0.000797	NR	NR	0.00108	ND	0.00215	ND	NR	NR

<sup>\*</sup> range provided represents the range of the treatment means

N/A- Not applicable

ND- Not determined

NR- Not reported

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

Table 5a: Reported effect of AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 on Vegetative Vigor

Species	Results	summary	for height			17309 02 52300 111				
	Plant height (cm)*	NOAEC	EC <sub>05</sub>	95%CI	EC <sub>25</sub>	95%CI	EC <sub>50</sub>	95%CI	slope	std err
Corn	75.1-96.4	0.0249	NR	NR	>0.0994	N/A	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Oat	75.4-80.4	0.0498	NR	NR	>0.0994	N/A	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Onion	6.2-11.6	0.0249	NR	NR	0.0491	0.0224-0.0725	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Ryegrass	26.1-33.8	0.0125	NR	NR	>0.0994	N/A	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Cucumber	25.3-39.0	0.000399	NR	NR	0.00399	0.00144-ND	>0.00622	N/A	NR	NR
Oilseed Rape	10.1-22.5	0.000399	NR	NR	0.00247	0.00124-0.00347	0.00566	0.00407-0.0122	NR.	NR
Soybean	29.0-39.8	0.000797	NR	NR	0.00562	0.00454-0.00757	>0.00622	N/A	NR	NR
Sugar beet	6.0-23.0	0.000399	NR	NR	0.00171	0.0024-0.00211	0.00351	0.00291-0.00435	NR	NR
Sunflower	4.4-10.9	0.000797	NR	NR	0.00355	ND	0.00542	ND	NR	NR
Tomato	2.5-13.6	0.000797	NR	NR	0.00140	0.000598-0.00199	0.00247	0.00171-0.00371	NR:	NR

<sup>\*</sup> range provided represents the range of the treatment means

N/A- Not applicable ND- Not determined NR- Not reported

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

## **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

Table 5b: Reported effect of AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 on Vegetative Vigor

Species	Results	summary	for surviv	al (lbs ai/A)						
	Survival relative to controls (%)*	NOAEC	EC <sub>05</sub>	95%CI	EC <sub>25</sub>	95%CI	EC <sub>50</sub>	95%CI	slope	std err
Corn	100	0.0994	NR	NR	>0.0994	N/A	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Oat	100	0.0994	NR	NR	>0.0994	N/A	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Onion	25-100	0.0498	NR	NR	0.0507	0.0140-0.0929	0.0643	0.0299-ND	NR	NR
Ryegrass	100	0.0994	NR	NR	>0.0994	N/A	>0.0994	N/A	NR	NR
Cucumber	100	0.00622	NR	NR	>0.00622	N/A	>0.0622	N/A	NR	NR
Oilseed Rape	95-100	0.00622	NR	NR	>0.00622	N/A	>0.0622	N/A	NR	NR
Soybean	98-100	0.00622	NR	NR	>0.00622	N/A.	>0.0622	N/A	NR	NR
Sugar beet	55-100	0.00311	NR	NR	0.00327	0.000518- 0.00861	0.00423	0.00171-0.0308	NR	NR
Sunflower	97.5-100	0.00622	NR	NR	>0.00622	N/A	>0.0622	N/A	NR	NR
Tomato	45-100	0.00156	NR	NR	0.00339	0.00271-0.00423	0.00546	0.00431-0.00694	NR	NR

<sup>\*</sup> range provided represents the range of the treatment means

N/A- Not applicable

ND- Not determined

NR- Not reported

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

Plant In	jury Inde	x*			<u> </u>						the state of the s
Control	Com	Oat	Onion	Ryegrass	Cucumber	Oilseed rape	Soybean	Sugar beet	Sunflower	Tomato	Adjuvant control
0%	0-80%	0-40%	0-80%	0-20%	0-60%	0-80%	0-60%	0-100%	0-80%	0-100%	N/A

<sup>\*0%-</sup> no injury or effect; 10-20%- slight symptoms throughout the whole plant or more moderate symptoms on a small area; 30-40%- moderate symptoms throughout the whole plant or severe symptoms on a limited area; 50-60%- severe symptoms throughout the whole plant with younger or newly developed leaves growing normally; 70-80%- total plant symptoms with the plant showing poor vigor; 90%- moribund or dying plant

#### C. VERIFICATION OF STATISTICAL RESULTS BY THE REVIEWER:

Statistical Method(s): Replicate data for dry weight and percent survival were first tested for the assumptions of ANOVA (normality and homogeneity) for any species exhibited a ≥5% reduction relative to the negative control. If these assumptions were met, the NOAEC values were determined by comparing the treatment data against the negative control data using the parametric Dunnetts Test (or Bonferonni's T-Test for unequal replicates) and William's Test. If the assumptions of ANOVA were not met, the NOAEC values were determined by comparing the treatment data against the negative control data using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test. All NOAEC values were determined using Toxstat statistical software. Plant height was not able to be analyzed because replicate mean values were not reported (only the range within each replicate was reported). Phytotoxicity was not reported as this is not a quantitative endpoint. The ECx values (with corresponding 95% C.I.) and probit slopes (when applicable) were determined using Nuthatch statistical software. When the % reduction was <5, <25 or <50%, the respective ECx values were determined visually. When 100% mortality was observed in the highest treatment level, these data were excluded from the analyses. All toxicity values were determined using the nominal application rates, which the reviewer converted to lbs ai/A

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### EPA MRID Number 468019-27

Table 6: Reviewer-calculated effect of AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 on Vegetative Vigor

Species	Results summ	ary for bioma	ss (lbs ai/A)							
	Dry weight (g)*	NOAEC	EC <sub>05</sub>	95%CI	EC <sub>25</sub>	95%CI	EC50	95%CI	slope	std err
Corn	1.620-4.450	0.0249	0.020	0.012-0.032	0.042	0.033-0.054	0.072	0.063-0.082	2.96	0.493
Oat	1.279-2.309	0.0249	0.015	0.0070-0.034	0.050	0.036-0.069	>0.0944	N/A	1.91	0.424
Onion	0.022-0.063	0.0125	0.0041	0.0010-0.016	0.017	0.0078-0.036	0.044	0.029-0.068	1.59	0.381
Ryegrass	0.559-0.751	0.0944	ND	ND	>0.0944	N/A	>0.0944	N/A	ND	ND
Cucumber	1.835-3.452	0.000797	0.00066	0.00024-0.0018	0.0029	0.0020-0.0044	>0.00622	N/A	1.49	0.341
Oilseed Rape	0.626-3.698	0.000797	0.00068	0.00045-0.0010	0.0015	0.0012-0.0020	0.0027	0.0023-0.0032	2.73	0.292
Soybean	0.621-2.054	0.000797	0.00056	0.00039-0.00078	0.0016	0.0013-0.0020	0.0034	0.0031-0.0038	2.09	0.160
Sugar beet	0.218-2.209	0.000399	0.00049	0.00037-0.00065	0.0011	0.00094-0.0013	0.0020	0.0018-0.0022	2.68	0.183
Sunflower	0.252-1.273	0.00156	0.0017	0.0013-0.0023	0.0029	0.0024-0.0034	0.0040	0.0036-0.0045	4.47	0.549
Tomato	0.149-1.061	0.000797	0.00023	4.3E <sup>-05</sup> -0.0012	0.00081	0.00029-0.0022	0.0019	0.0010-0.0036	1.78	0.503

<sup>\*</sup> range provided represents the range of the treatment means

N/A- Not applicable

ND- Not determined

NR- Not reported

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### EPA MRID Number 468019-27

Table 6a: Reported effect of AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 on Seedling Emergence

Species	Results	summary	for survival	(lbs ai/A)						
	Survival relative to controls (%)*	NOAEC	EC <sub>05</sub>	95%C1	EC <sub>25</sub>	95%CI	EC <sub>50</sub>	95%CI	slope	std err
Corn	100	0.0944	>0.0944	N/A	>0.0944	N/A	>0.0944	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oat	100	0.0944	>0.0944	N/A	>0.0944	N/A	>0.0944	N/A	N/A	N/A
Onion	25-100	0.0498	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Ryegrass	100	0.0944	>0.0944	N/A	>0.0944	N/A	>0.0944	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cucumber	100	0.00622	>0.00622	N/A	>0.00622	N/A	>0.00622	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oilseed Rape	95-100	0.00622	ND	ND	>0.00622	N/A	>0.00622	N/A	N/A	N/A
Soybean	98-100	0.00622	>0.00622	N/A	>0.00622	N/A	>0.00622	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sugar beet	55-100	0.00311	ND	ND	ND	ND	>0.00622	N/A	ND	ND
Sunflower	97.5-100	0.00622	>0.00622	N/A	>0.00622	N/A	>0.00622	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tomato	45-100	0.00156	0.0013	0.00069-0.0025	0.0030	0.0022-0.0041	0.0054	0.0045-0.0064	2.67	0.574

<sup>\*</sup> range provided represents the range of the treatment means

N/A- Not applicable

ND- Not determined

NR- Not reported

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

Plant In	jury Inde	X*									
Control	Corn	Oat	Onion	Ryegrass	Cucumber	Oilseed rape	Soybean	Sugar beet	Sunflower	Tomato	Adjuvant control
0%	0-80%	0-40%	0-80%	0-20%	0-60%	0-80%	0-60%	0-100%	0-80%	0-100%	N/A

<sup>\*0%-</sup> no injury or effect; 10-20%- slight symptoms throughout the whole plant or more moderate symptoms on a small area; 30-40%- moderate symptoms throughout the whole plant or severe symptoms on a limited area; 50-60%- severe symptoms throughout the whole plant with younger or newly developed leaves growing normally; 70-80%- total plant symptoms with the plant showing poor vigor; 90%- moribund or dying plant

#### Monocot

NOAEC: 0.0125

(14.2 g a.i./ha)

Slope: 1.59 Std err: 0.381

Most sensitive monocot: Onion Most sensitive parameter: Dry Weight

#### **Dicot**

NOAEC: 0.000797 lbs ai/A

(0.89 g a.i./ha)

Slope: 1.78 Std err: 0.503

Most sensitive dicot: Tomato

Most sensitive parameter: Dry Weight

#### D. STUDY DEFICIENCIES:

Because EC<sub>25</sub> values could not be determined for onion and sugar beet survival, the reviewer is unsure whether dry weight was in fact the most sensitive endpoint for both of the species. Additionally, the reviewer was unable to statistically analyze plant height because the study authors only reported the range of values within each replicate and the treatment mean; no replicate mean values were reported.

#### **E. REVIEWERS' COMMENTS:**

The reviewers' conclusions were identical to the study authors', in that onion and tomato were the most sensitive species based on dry weight; the NOAEC estimates were identical, but EC<sub>x</sub> values differed slightly. The reviewers' statistical analysis provided more reliable 95% confidence intervals, EC<sub>05</sub> values and probit slopes (when applicable); therefore, the reviewers' results for the most sensitive monocot and dicot are provided in the Executive Summary and Conclusions sections of this DER.

The percent inhibitions for ryegrass dry weight were -18, -5, 7, -20 and 11% at the nominal 0.00622, 0.0125, 0.0249, 0.0498 and 0.0944 lbs ai/A treatment levels, respectively, relative to the negative control. Because the response was non-linear and did not appear to be dose-dependent, the reviewer agrees with the statistical output

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

that the NOAEC value is 0.0944 lbs ai/A, despite the 11% reduction at this level. The reviewer's statistical software was unable to determine the  $EC_{05}$  value for ryegrass dry weight; however, because a reliable NOAEC was determined and the  $EC_{25}$  and  $EC_{50}$  values were visually determined to be greater than the highest treatment level (0.0944 lbs ai/A), the reviewer does not feel the lack of an  $EC_{05}$  negatively impacts the acceptability or scientific validity of the study.

The percent inhibitions for sunflower dry weight were -2, 0, 0, 2, 30 and 80% at the nominal 0.000199, 0.000399, 0.000797, 0.00156, 0.00311 and 0.00622 lbs ai/A treatment levels, respectively, relative to the negative control. Because the of the non-linear response of the data, the reviewer had to analyze the data using a non-parametric test; consequently, the reviewer's analysis did not detect a significant difference at the 0.00311 lbs ai/A treatment level despite the 30% inhibition at this level. The reviewer visually determined the NOAEC value to be 0.00156 lbs ai/A.

The percent inhibitions for tomato dry weight were -8, -41, 1, 47, 80 and 64% at the nominal 0.000199, 0.000399, 0.000797, 0.00156, 0.00311 and 0.00622 lbs ai/A treatment levels, respectively, relative to the negative control. Because the of the non-linear response of the data, the reviewer had to analyze the data using a non-parametric test; consequently, the reviewer's analysis did not detect a significant difference at the 0.00156 lbs ai/A treatment level despite the 47% inhibition at this level, which the reviewer felt to be significant. The reviewer visually determined the NOAEC value to be 0.000797 lbs ai/A.

The highest treatment level for onion, 0.0994 lbs ai/A, was the only treatment level which exhibited a reduction in survival relative to the negative control; a reduction of 75% was observed. As a reduction was only observed at this one treatment level, a non-linear response of the data was observed. Because only two distinct isotone means were observed where three or more are necessary, probit analysis was unable to accurately determine ECx values based on onion survival data. The PMRA reviewer-calculated EC<sub>25</sub> estimate for onion survival was 75.4 g a.i./ha (95% CI: 71.44 – 80.10 g a.i./ha) using the Norberg-King (1993) ICp model. This model can be used to provide a non-parametric endpoint estimation for continuous survival data (ToxStat 1996).

A 5% reduction in oilseed rape percent survival was observed at the highest treatment level, 0.00622 lbs ai/A; reductions were not observed in any of the other treatment levels. As only two distinct isotone means existed where three or more are necessary, the probit analysis was unable to determine an EC<sub>05</sub> value; however, a reliable NOAEC value was determined.

The highest treatment level for sugar beet, 0.00622 lbs ai/A, was the only treatment level which exhibited a reduction in survival relative to the negative control; a reduction of 45% was observed. As a reduction was only observed at this one treatment level, a non-linear response of the data was observed. Because only two distinct isotone means were observed where three or more are necessary, probit analysis was unable to accurately determine  $EC_{05}$  and  $EC_{25}$  values based on sugar beet survival data. The PMRA reviewer-calculated  $EC_{25}$  estimate for sugar beet survival was 5.5 g a.i./ha (95% CI: N/A) using the Norberg-King (1993) ICp model.

The percent inhibitions for tomato percent survival were 0% at the nominal 0.000199-0.00156 lbs ai/A treatment levels, and 30 and 55% in the nominal 0.00311 and 0.00622 lbs ai/A treatment levels, respectively, relative to the negative control. Because the of the non-linear response of the data, the reviewer had to analyze the data using a non-parametric test; consequently, the reviewer's analysis did not detect a significant difference at the 0.00311 lbs ai/A treatment level despite the 30% inhibition at this level, which the reviewer felt to be significant. The reviewer visually determined the NOAEC value to be 0.00156 lbs ai/A.

Based on  $EC_{25}$  values for onion and sugar beet survival determined using ICp analysis, it appears that dry weight is the most sensitive endpoint for these species. The reviewer-reported NOAEC and  $EC_{25}$  values for dry weight for both species are reported in Table 1 (Summary of most sensitive parameters by species) in this DER.

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

The reviewer was unable to statistically analyze plant height because the study authors only reported the range of values within each replicate and the treatment mean; no replicate mean values were reported. Based on the treatment mean values, the reviewer was able to calculate the percent reductions at each treatment level, relative to the negative control, for each species. Onion was the only monocot species to exhibit a reduction of >25% relative to the negative control. The reductions for oat and ryegrass were  $\leq$ 10% at all treatment levels relative to the negative control. Corn exhibited reductions of 17.5 and 20.2% at the nominal 0.0498 and 0.0944 lbs ai/A treatment levels, respectively, and the dose-response relationship appeared to be dose dependent. All dicot species exhibited reductions of >25% in plant height at one or more treatment levels, relative to each species' negative control. All dose-responses relationships appeared both linear and dose-dependent; however, the lack of plant height raw data precludes the statistical verification of the study authors' results.

The study authors report that only the highest application rate was analytically verified for the presence of the material. Percent recovery was 95.7% of nominal. Because only the highest application rate was analytically verified and not all species received the same range of doses, the reviewer did not use the one mean-measured application in the statistical analyses.

All species were tested under the same environmental conditions instead of testing cold-preferring species separately from warm-preferring species. The less-than-optimal environmental conditions could have had a synergistic effect with the test material, potentially confounding the observed results which are attributed entirely to the exposure of the test material.

The test material, AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102, was a formulation containing the active ingredients AE 0317309 (purity of 4.53% w/w) and AE F107892 (purity of 1.17% w/w). The reviewer corrected all nominal application rates for the purity of AE 0317309 and converted theses rates into lbs ai/A.

The DEH reviewer notes that while tomatoes had the lowest EC25 in the plant biomass (dry shoot weight), sugar beet had the lowest LOEC and NOEC of 0.02 and 0.01 kg product/ha, corresponding to 0.91 and 0.45 g ac/ha.

The dates of experimental work for the definitive seedling emergence study were April 13-May 18, 2004.

#### F. CONCLUSIONS:

The study is considered **SUPPLEMENTAL** to the **US EPA** and **ACCEPTABLE** to the **PMRA** and **DEH**. The most sensitive monocot, based on dry weight, was onion with NOAEC and EC<sub>25</sub> values of 0.0125 and 0.017 lbs ai/A, respectively. The most sensitive dicot, based on dry weight, was tomato with NOAEC and EC<sub>25</sub> values of 0.000797 and 0.00081 lbs ai/A, respectively.

Most sensitive monocot and EC<sub>25</sub>: Onion (Dry Weight), 0.017 lbs ai/A (or, 19.1 g a.i./ha) Most sensitive dicot and EC<sub>25</sub>: Tomato (Dry Weight), 0.00081 lbs ai/A (or, 0.91 g a.i./ha)

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446 III. <u>REFERENCES</u>:

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

BBA (Mai 2000): EPPO Standard PP 1/135 (2), Phytotoxicity Assessment.

- BBCH-Monograph. Growth stages of Mono- and Dicotyledonous Plants, Federal Biological Research Centre for Agriculture and Forestry, 1997.
- Chemikaliengesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (ChemG), Anhang 1. in der Fassung der Bekanntmachung vom 20.03.2002 (BGBI. I S. 2090).
- Holst, R.W. and Ellwanger, T.C. 1982. Pesticide Assessment Guidelines, Sub-division J, Hazard Evaluation: Non Target Plants, PB83-153940; EPA540/9-82-020; Series 123; Tier 2 of Non-target Area Testing; §123-1, US EPA, Washington, DC.
- Norberg-King, T. 1993. National Effluent Toxicity Assessment Center Technical Report 03-93. A linear interpolation method for sublethal toxicity: The inhibition concentration (ICp) approach. Version 2.0. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Laboratory Duluth, MN 55804.
- OECD (Draft Document July 2000): Guideline for the testing of chemicals, Proposal for updating Guideline 208 "Terrestrial (Non-Target) Plant Test: 208A: Seedling Emergence and Seedling Growth Test. 208B: Vegetative Vigor Test."
- THE OECD PRINCIPLES OF GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICE, adopted by Council on 26<sup>th</sup> November 1997 [C(97)186/Final]. Environmental Directorate, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris 1998.

ToxStat. 1996. ToxStat v.3.5 User's Manual. Western EcoSystems Technology, Inc. Cheyenne, WY.

Ratte. M. ToxRat Professional 2.09: ToxRat Solutions GmbH, Naheweg 15, 52477 Alsdorf.

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

## APPENDIX I. OUTPUT OF REVIEWER'S STATISTICAL VERIFICATION:

Corn dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927cw

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	6	55.089	9.181	21.860
Within (Error)	49	20.558	0.420	
Total	55	75.647		

Critical F value = 2.34 (0.05, 6, 40)

Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

Corn dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927cw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - TA	ABLE 1 OF 2	Ho:Control <tr< th=""><th>eatment</th><th></th></tr<>	eatment	
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1 2 3 4 5	neg control 0.00311 0.00622 0.0125 0.0249	4.075 4.108 4.362 4.323 4.262	4.075 4.108 4.362 4.323 4.262	-0.104 -0.886 -0.766 -0.577	
6	0.0498	2.628	2.628	4.465	*
7	0.0944	1.620	1.620	7.576	*

Dunnett table value = 2.37 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=40,6)

Corn dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927cw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - T	TABLE 2 OF	2 Ho:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUE	P IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	neg control	8			
2	0.00311	8	0.768	18.8	-0.034
3	0.00622	8	0.768	18.8	-0.287
4	0.0125	8	0.768	18.8	-0.248
5	0.0249	8	0.768	18.8	-0.187
6	0.0498	8	0.768	18.8	1.447
7	0.0944	8	0.768	18.8	2.455

Corn dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927cw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	neg control	8	4.075	4.075	4.226
2	0.00311	8	4.108	4.108	4.226
3	0.00622	8	4.362	4.362	4.226
4	0.0125	8	4.323	4.323	4.226
5	0.0249	8	4.262	4.262	4.226
6	0.0498	8	2.628	2.628	2.628
7	0.0944	8	1.620	1.620	1.620

Corn dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21
File: 1927cw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST	(Isotonic	regression	model)	TABLE 2 O	F 2
IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
neg control 0.00311 0.00622 0.0125 <b>0.0249</b> 0.0498 0.0944	4.226 4.226 4.226 4.226 4.226 2.628 1.620	0.467 0.467 0.467 <b>0.467</b> 4.467 7.580	* *	1.68 1.76 1.79 <b>1.80</b> 1.80	k= 1, v=49 k= 2, v=49 k= 3, v=49 k= 4, v=49 k= 5, v=49 k= 6, v=49

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	ınds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	0.020	0.012	0.032	0.10	0.62	
EC10	0.026	0.018	0.039	0.085	0.68	
EC25	0.042	0.033	0.054	0.054	0.78	
EC50	0.072	0.063	0.082	0.030	0.87	

Slope = 2.96 Std.Err. = 0.493

Goodness of fit: p = 0.21 based on DF= 4.0 49.

1927CW : Corn dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00	4.07 4.11 4.36 4.32 4.26	4.27 4.27 4.27 4.22 3.90	-0.196 -0.163 0.0944 0.104	100. 100. 99.9 98.8 91.3	0.00 0.00272 0.0832 1.23 8.69
	8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00	Mean  8.00 4.07  8.00 4.11  8.00 4.36  8.00 4.32	Mean     Mean       8.00     4.07     4.27       8.00     4.11     4.27       8.00     4.36     4.27       8.00     4.32     4.22	Mean     Mean     -Pred.       8.00     4.07     4.27     -0.196       8.00     4.11     4.27     -0.163       8.00     4.36     4.27     0.0944       8.00     4.32     4.22     0.104	Mean         Mean         -Pred.         %Control           8.00         4.07         4.27         -0.196         100.           8.00         4.11         4.27         -0.163         100.           8.00         4.36         4.27         0.0944         99.9           8.00         4.32         4.22         0.104         98.8

## PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

0.0498	8.00	2.63	2.91	-0.277	68.0	32.0
0.0944	8.00	1.62	1.54	0.0758	36.1	63.9

Oat dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927ow Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	5	6.504	1.301	15.866
Within (Error)	42	3.440	0.082	
Total	47	9.944		

Critical F value = 2.45 (0.05,5,40) Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

Oat dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927ow Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

Dunnett table value = 2.31 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=40,5)

Oat dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927ow Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - T	ABLE 2 OF	2 но:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	neg control	8:			
2	0.00622	. 8	0.331	14.4	-0.007
- 3	0.0125	8	0.331	14.4	0.128
4	0.0249	8	0.331	14.4	0.226
5	0.0498	8	0.331	14.4	0.572
. 6	0.0944	8	0.331	14.4	1.023

Oat dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927ow Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	neg control	8	2.302	2.302	2.305
2	0.00622	8	2.309	2.309	2.305
3	0.0125	8	2.174	2.174	2.174
4	0.0249	8	2.075	2.075	2.075
5	0.0498	8	1.729	1.729	1.729
6	0.0944	8	1.279	1.279	1,279

Oat dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927ow Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model)

	MITTITIME	I FOT	(ISOCOUIC	regression	moder)	TABLE Z C	)F 2	
								•
		;	ISOTONIZED	CALC.	SIG	TABLE	DEGREES OF	
IDEN'	TIFICATION TIPICATION	NT	MEAN	WILLIAMS	P=.05	WILLIAMS	FREEDOM	

neg control 2.305 0.00622 2.305 0.025 1.68 k= 1, v=42 0.0125 2.174 0.893 1.76 k= 2, v=42 **0.0249 2.075 1.582 1.79 k= 3, v=42** 0.0498 1.729 3.999 \* 1.80 k= 4, v=42 0.0944 1.279 7.149 \* 1.80 k= 5, v=42

0.286

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

#### Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	nds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
EC5	0.015	Lower <b>0.0070</b>	Upper 0.034	0.17	/Estimate 0.45	
EC10	0.024	0.013	0.044	0.13	0.54	
EC25	0.050	0.036	0.069	0.071	0.72	
EC50	0.11	0.088	0.14	0.053	0.78	

1.91 Std.Err. =

Goodness of fit: p = 0.96 based on DF= 3.0 42. 

19270W : Oat dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
0.00 0.00622 0.0125 0.0249 0.0498	8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00	2.30 2.31 2.17 2.08 1.73 1.28	2.30 2.28 2.22 2.06 1.73 1.28	0.00157 0.0275 -0.0477 0.0178 0.00384 -0.00301	100. 99.2 96.6 89.5 75.0 55.7	0.00 0.813 3.41 10.5 25.0 44.3

<sup>!!!</sup>Warning: EC50 not bracketed by doses evaluated.

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

Onion dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927nw Tra

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F		
Between	6	0.0118	0.0020	10.000		
Within (Error)	45	0.0075	0.0002			
Total	51	0.0193				

Critical F value = 2.34 (0.05,6,40) Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

Onion dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927nw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

E	BONFERRONI T-TEST -	TABLE 1 OF 2	Ho:Contro	Ho:Control <treatment< th=""></treatment<>			
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	т ѕтат	sig		
1 2 3 4 5 6	neg control 0.00311 0.00622 0.0125 0.0249 0.0498 0.0944	0.050 0.067 0.057 0.051 0.033 0.025 0.022	0.050 0.067 0.057 0.051 0.033 0.025 0.022	-2.316 -1.008 -0.035 2.386 3.411 3.479	*		

Bonferroni T table value = 2.50 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=40,6)

•

Onion dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927nw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

BONFERRONI T-TEST - TABLE 2 OF 2					Ho:Control <treatment< th=""></treatment<>			
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL			
1 2 3 4 5 6	neg control 0.00311 0.00622 0.0125 0.0249 0.0498 0.0944	8 8 8 8 8 8 7 5	0.018 0.018 0.018 0.018 0.018 0.018	35.2 35.2 35.2 35.2 36.4 40.1	-0.016 -0.007 -0.000 0.017 0.025 0.028			

Onion dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927nw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION		ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	neg control	.8	0.050	0.050	0.058
2	0.00311	8	0.067	0.067	0.058
. 3	0.00622	8	0.057	0.057	0.057
4	0.0125	8	0.051	0.051	0.051
5	0.0249	8	0.033	0.033	0.033
6	0.0498	7	0.025	0.025	0.025
7	0.0944	5	0.022	0.022	0.022

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model)

Onion dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927nw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS	TEST	(Isotonic	regression	model)	TABLE 2	OF 2
 			-,			

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
neg control	0.058				
0.00311	0.058	1.256		1.68	k = 1, v = 45
0.00622	0.057	1.093		1.76	k = 2, v = 45
0.0125	0.051	0.038		1.79	k=3, v=45
0.0249	0.033	2.589	*	1.80	k = 4, v = 45
0.0498	0.025	3.700	*	1.80	k=5, $v=45$
0.0944	0.022	3.774	*	1.81	k=6, v=45

s = 0.013

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

#### Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	nds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	0.0041	0.0010	0.016	0.30	0.25	
EC10	0.0069	0.0022	0.022	0.25	0.32	
EC25	0.017	0.0078	0.036	0.16	0.47	
EC50	0.044	0.029	0.068	0.092	0.65	
EC50	0.044	0.029	0.068	0.092	0.65	

Slope = 1.59 Std.Err. = 0.381

!!!Poor fit: p = 0.034 based on DF= 4.0 45.

1927NW : Onion dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

_							
	Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
	0.00	8.00	0.0502	0.0595	-0.00928	100.	0.00
	0.00311	8.00	0.0666	0.0575	0.00909	96.7	3.34
	0.00622	8.00	0.0574	0.0543	0.00307	91.2	8.78
	0.0125	8.00	0.0505	0.0481	0.00235	80.9	19.1
	0.0249	8.00	0.0334	0.0390	-0.00561	65.5	34.5
	0.0498	7.00	0.0253	0.0279	-0.00261	46.9	53.1

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

0.0944

5.00

0.0222

0.0180 0.00424

30.2

69.8

Onion % survival, lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927ns

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANOVA BY RANKS - TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	RANK SUM
1	neg control	100.000	100.000	260.000
2	0.00311	100.000	100.000	260.000
3	0.00622	100.000	100.000	260.000
4	0.0125	100.000	100.000	260.000
5	0.0249	100.000	100.000	260.000
6	0.0498	100.000	100.000	260.000
7	0.0944	25.000	25.000	36.000

Calculated H Value = 765.092

Critical H Value Table = 12.590

Since Calc  ${\tt H}$  > Crit  ${\tt H}$  REJECT Ho:All groups are equal.

Onion % survival, lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927ns Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

DUNNS MULTIPLE COMPARISON - KRUSKAL-WALLIS - TABLE 2 OF 2

						GI	ROU	JΡ					
		TRANSFORMED	ORIGINAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	MEAN	MEAN	7	2	3	4	5	6	1			
			~	_	-	_	_		_	_			
7	0.0944	25.000	25.000	\									
2	0.00311	100.000	100.000	*	\								
3	0.00622	100.000	100.000	*		\							
4	0.0125	100.000	100.000	*	•		\						
5	0.0249	100.000	100.000	*				\					
6	0.0498	100.000	100.000	*			•	•	١				
1	neg control	100.000	100.000	*				٠		\			

\* = significant difference (p=0.05) . = no significant difference Table q value (0.05,7) = 3.038

SE = 8.618

Ryegrass dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927gw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	5	0.252	0.050	4.167
Within (Error)	42	0.506	0.012	
Total	47	0.758		

Critical F value = 2.45 (0.05,5,40)

Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho: All groups equal

# **JS EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT**

## Data Evaluation Report on the Acute Toxicity of AE 0317309 02 SE06 A102 to Terrestrial Vascular Plants: Vegetative Vigor

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

Ryegrass dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927gw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - TA	ABLE 1 OF 2	Ho:Control <tr< th=""><th>eatment</th><th></th></tr<>	eatment	
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1	neg control	0.626	0.626		
2	0.00622	0.740	0.740	-2.084	
3	0.0125	0.656	0.656	-0.539	
4	0.0249	0.585	0.585	0.758	
5	0.0498	0.751	0.751	-2.287	
6	0.0944	0.559	0.559	1.221	

Dunnett table value = 2.31 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=40,5)

Ryegrass dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927gw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - T	ABLE 2 OF	2 но:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	neg control	8			
2	0.00622	8	0.127	20.2	-0.114
3	0.0125	8	0.127	20.2	-0.029
4	0.0249	8	0.127	20.2	0.042
5	0.0498	8	0.127	20.2	-0.125
6	0.0944	8	0.127	20.2	0.067

Ryegrass dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927gw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isot	tonic regression	model) '	TABLE 1	OF	2
---------------------	------------------	----------	---------	----	---

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
Т	neg control	8	0.626	0.626	0.683
2	0.00622	8	0.740	0.740	0.683
3	0.0125	8	0.656	0.656	0.664
4	0.0249	8	0.585	0.585	0.664
5	0.0498	8	0.751	0.751	0.664
6	0.0944	8	0.559	0.559	0.559

Ryegrass dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927gw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

 WILLIAMS	(Isotonic	regression	model)	TABLE 2 O	F 2
	ISOTONIZED	CALC.	SIG	TABLE	DEGREES OF

Page 32 of 45

PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446	,
----------------------------------	---

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

IDENTIFICATION	MEAN	WILLIAMS	P=.05	WILLIAMS	FREEDOM
 neg control	0.683				
0.00622	0.683	1.040		1.68	k = 1, v = 42
0.0125	0.664	0.688		1.76	k = 2, v = 42
0.0249	0.664	0.688		1.79	k = 3, v = 42
0.0498	0.664	0.688		1.80	k=4, $v=42$
0.0944	0.559	1.218		1.80	k=5, $v=42$

0.110

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

#### Cucumber dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927uw

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	6	17.927	2.988	15.402
Within (Error)	63	12.200	0.194	
Total	69	30.127		

Critical F value = 2.25 (0.05,6,60) Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

Cucumber dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927uw

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

. D	UNNETTS TEST - TAI	Ho:Control <treatment< th=""></treatment<>			
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	sig
1	neg control	2.991	2.991		
2	0.000199	3.452	3.452	-2.339	
3	0.000399	3.257	3.257	-1.350	
4	0.000797	3.047	3.047	-0.280	
5	0.00156	2.550	2.550	2.239	
6	0.00311	2.537	2.537	2.305	
7 ·	0.00622	1.836	1.836	5.868	*

Dunnett table value = 2.35 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=60,6)

Cucumber dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927uw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - '	TABLE 2 OF	2 Ho:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	neg control	10			
2	0.000199	10	0.463	15.5	-0.461
3	0.000399	10	0.463	15.5	-0.266
			Page 33 of 45		

ion Number 2006-24	446		EPA MR	ID Number 468019-27
0.000797	10	0.463	15.5	-0.055
0.00156	10	0.463	15.5	0.441
0.00311	10	0.463	15.5	0.454
0.00622	10	0.463	15.5	1.156
j	0.000797 0.00156 0.00311	0.00156 10 0.00311 10	0.000797       10       0.463         0.00156       10       0.463         0.00311       10       0.463	0.000797       10       0.463       15.5         0.00156       10       0.463       15.5         0.00311       10       0.463       15.5

Cucumber dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927uw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	WILLIAMS TEST	(Isotonic	regression	model) TABLE 1	OF 2
GROUP			ORIGINA	TRANSFORMED	ISOTONIZED
	TORNTTETCATTO	M M	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN

GINC	JOE	IDENTIFICATION	N	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
	1	neg control	10	2.991	2.991	3.234
	2	0.000199	10	3.452	3.452	3.234
	3	0.000399	10	3.257	3.257	3.234
	4	0.000797	10	3.047	3.047	3.047
	5	0.00156	10	2.550	2.550	2.550
	6	0.00311	10	2.537	2.537	2.537
	7	0.00622	10	1.836	1.836	1.836

Cucumber dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927uw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

 WI	LLIAMS	TEST	(Isotonic	regression	model)	TAI	BLE 2	OF	2	
IDENTIF	ICATIO	Ŋ	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05		BLE LIAMS		DEGREE FREEI	
	eg cont		3.234	4 004						

neg control	3.234				
0.000199	3.234	1.231		1.67	k = 1, v = 63
0.000399	3.234	1.231		1.75	k = 2, v = 63
0.000797	3.047	0.280		1.77	k = 3, v = 63
0.00156	2.550	2.241	*	1.78	k = 4, v = 63
0.00311	2.537	2.307	*	1.79	k = 5, v = 63
0.00622	1.836	5.873	*	1.79	k = 6, v = 63

s = 0.440

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bounds		Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	0.00066	0.00024	0.0018	0.22	0.36	
EC10	0.0012	0.00053	0.0025	0.17	0.46	
EC25	0.0029	0.0020	0.0044	0.088	0.67	
EC50	0.0083	0.0059	0.012	0.074	0.71	

Slope = 1.49 Std.Err. = 0.341

!!!Poor fit: p = 0.047 based on DF= 4.0 63.

1927UW : Cucumber dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
0.00	10.0	2.99	3.24	-0.245	100.	0.00
0.000199	10.0	3.45	3.21	0.241	99.2	0.774
0.000399	10.0	3.26	3.16	0.100	97.6	2.44
0.000797	10.0	3.05	3.03	0.0180	93.6	6.41
0.00156	10.0	2.55	2.79	-0.237	86.1	13.9
0.00311	10.0	2.54	2.39	0.147	73.9	26.1
0.00622	10.0	1.84	1.86	-0.0258	57.5	42.5
0.000	_0.0			0.020	J	

!!!Warning: EC50 not bracketed by doses evaluated.

#### Oilseed rape dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927dw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	6	69.268	11.545	43.566
Within (Error)	49	13.002	0.265	
Total	55	82.270		

Critical F value = 2.34 (0.05,6,40) Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

Oilseed rape dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927dw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - TA	ABLE 1 OF 2	Ho:Control <treatment< th=""></treatment<>				
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG		
1	neg control	3.698	3.698				
2	0.000199	3.632	3.632	0.254			
3	0.000399	3.459	3.459	0.925			
4	0.000797	3.426	3.426	1.054			
5	0.00156	2.793	2.793	3.517	*		
6	0.00311	1.521	1.521	8.457	*		
7	0.00622	0.626	0.626	11.932	*		

Dunnett table value = 2.37 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=40,6)

Oilseed rape dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927dw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - T	PABLE 2 OF	2 но:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
CDOUD			Minimum Sig Diff		DIFFERENCE
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	REPS	(IN ORIG. UNITS)	CONTROL	FROM CONTROL

PMRA Sul	PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446			EPA MRI	D Number 468019-27	7
1	neg control	. 8				
2	0.000199	8	0.610	16.5	0.065	
3	0.000399	8	0.610	16.5	0.238	
4	0.000797	8	0.610	16.5	0.271	
5	0.00156	8	0.610	16.5	0.905	
6	0.00311	8	0.610	16.5	2.177	
7	0.00622	8	0.610	16.5	3.071	

Oilseed rape dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927dw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	neg control	8	3.698	3.698	3.698
2	0.000199	8	3.632	3.632	3.632
3	0.000399	8	3.459	3.459	3.459
4	0.000797	8	3.426	3.426	3.426
5	0.00156	- 8	2.793	2.793	2.793
6	0.00311	8	1.521	1.521	1.521
7	0.00622	8	0.626	0.626	0.626

Oilseed rape dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927dw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
neg control	3.698				
0.000199	3.632	0.253		1.68	k= 1, v=49
0.000399	3.459	0.925		1.76	k = 2, v = 49
0.000797	3.426	1.053		1.79	k = 3, v = 49
0.00156	2.793	3.514	*	1.80	k = 4, v = 49
0.00311	1.521	8.451	*	1.80	k = 5, v = 49
0.00622	0.626	11.924	*	1.81	k = 6, v = 49

s = 0.515

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate 95% Bounds		Std.Err.	Lower Bound		
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	0.00068	0.00045	0.0010	0.089	0.66	
EC10	0.00093	0.00065	0.0013	0.076	0.71	
EC25	0.0015	0.0012	0.0020	0.054	0.78	
EC50	0.0027	0.0023	0.0032	0.033	0.86	

Slope = 2.73 Std.Err. = 0.292

Goodness of fit: p = 0.89 based on DF= 4.0 49.

### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

1927DW : Oilseed rape dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

·					<b></b>	<del></del> _
Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
0.00	8.00	3.70	3.64	0.0623	100.	0.00
0.000199	8.00	3.63	3.63	0.000531	99.9	0.0955
0.000399	8.00	3.46	3.59	-0.135	98.9	1.13
0.000797	8.00	3.43	3.37	0.0526	92.8	7.20
0.00156	8.00	2.79	2.72	0.0754	74.7	25.3
0.00311	8.00	1.52	1.60	-0.0796	44.0	56.0
0.00622	8.00	0.626	0.603	0.0236	16.6	83.4

### Soybean dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927sw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	
Between	6	15.232	2.539	90.679	
Within (Error)	49	1.348	0.028		
Total	55	16.580			

Critical F value = 2.34 (0.05,6,40) Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

Soybean dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927sw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1	neg control	2.028	2.028		
2	0.000199	2.054	2.054	-0.315	
3	0.000399	1.989	1.989	0.459	
. 4	0.000797	1.909	1.909	1.416	
5	0.00156	1.583	1.583	5.317	*
6	0.00311	1.045	1.045	11.751	*
7	0.00622	0.621	0.621	16.817	*

Soybean dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927sw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST -	TABLE 2 OF	2 Ho:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)		DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
			Page 37 of 45		

### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

1	neg control	8			
2	0.000199	8	0.198	9.8	-0.026
3	0.000399	8	0.198	9.8	0.038
4	0.000797	8	0.198	9.8	0.119
5	0.00156	8	0.198	9.8	0.445
6	0.00311	8	0.198	9.8	0.983
7	0.00622	8	0.198	9.8	1.407

Soybean dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927sw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

> WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP			ORIGINAL	TRANSFORMED	ISOTONIZED
	IDENTIFICATION	N	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
1	neg control	8	2.028	2.028	2.041
2	0.000199	8	2.054	2.054	2.041
3	0.000399	8	1.989	1.989	1.989
4	0.000797	8	1.909	1.909	1.909
5	0.00156	8	1.583	1.583	1.583
6	0.00311	8	1.045	1.045	1.045
7	0.00622	8	0.621	0.621	0.621

Soybean dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927sw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED	CALC.	SIG	TABLE	DEGREES OF
	MEAN	WILLIAMS	P=.05	WILLIAMS	FREEDOM
neg control 0.000199 0.000399 0.000797 0.00156 0.00311 0.00622	2.041 2.041 1.989 <b>1.909</b> 1.583 1.045 0.621	0.159 0.463 <b>1.429</b> 5.363 11.853 16.963	* *	1.68 1.76 <b>1.79</b> 1.80 1.80	k= 1, v=49 k= 2, v=49 <b>k= 3, v=49</b> k= 4, v=49 k= 5, v=49 k= 6, v=49

0.166

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

Estimates of EC%

					·	. – – – -
Parameter	Estimate	95% Bot	ınds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	0.00056	0.00039	0.00078	0.074	0.71	
EC10	0.00083	0.00063	0.0011	0.061	0.75	
EC25	0.0016	0.0013	0.0020	0.041	0.83	
EC50	0.0034	0.0031	0.0038	0.023	0.90	

Slope = 2.09 Std.Err. =

\_\_\_\_\_\_

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

Goodness of fit: p = 0.69 based on DF= 4.0

1927SW : Soybean dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
0.00 0.000199	8.00 8.00	2.03 2.05	2.06 2.05	-0.0283 0.00839	100. 99.5	0.00 0.500
0.000399 0.000797	8.00 8.00	1.99 1.91	2.00 1.86	-0.0134 0.0462	97.4 90.6	2.59 9.39
0.00156 0.00311 0.00622	8.00 8.00	1.58 1.04 0.621	1.56 1.10	0.0190 -0.0511 0.0192	76.1 53.3 29.3	23.9 46.7 70.7
0.00622	8.00	0.02I	0.601	0.0192	49.3	70.7

## Sugar beet dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927bw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	6	29.541	4.924	153.875
Within (Error)	48	1.533	0.032	
Total	54	31.074		

Critical F value = 2.34 (0.05, 6, 40)

Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho: All groups equal

Sugar beet dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927bw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	BONFERRONI T-TEST -	TABLE 1 OF 2	Ho:Contro	l <treatm< th=""><th>ent</th></treatm<>	ent
GROUP	o identification	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	sig
1	neg control	2.111	2.111		
2	0.000199	2.209	2.209	-1.090	
3	0.000399	2.184	2.184	-0.818	
4	0.000797	1.881	1.881	2.577	*
5	0.00156	1.360	1.360	8.394	*
6	0.00311	0.630	0.630	16.558	*
7	0.00622	0.218	0.218	20.443	*

Bonferroni T table value = 2.50 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=40,6)

Sugar beet dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927bw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

BONFERRONI T-TEST - TABLE 2 OF 2

Ho:Control<Treatment

NUM OF Minimum Sig Diff % of DIFFERENCE

PMRA S	Submission Number 2006-	2446	*		EPA M	RID Number 468019-2	<b>:7</b>
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	REPS	(IN ORIG.	UNITS)	CONTROL	FROM CONTROL	
1	neg control	8					
2	0.000199	8	. 0	.224	10.6	-0.097	
. 3	0.000399	8	0	.224	10.6	-0.073	
4	0.000797	8	0	.224	10.6	0.231	
5	0.00156	8	. 0	.224	10.6	0.751	
6	0.00311	8	0	.224	10.6	1.481	
7	0.00622	7	0	.231	11.0	1.893	

Sugar beet dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927bw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	neg control	8	2.111	2.111	2.168
2	0.000199	8	2.209	2.209	2.168
3	0.000399	8	2.184	2.184	2.168
4	0.000797	8	1.881	1.881	1.881
5	0.00156	. 8	1.360	1.360	1.360
6	0.00311	8	0.630	0.630	0.630
7	0.00622	7	0.218	0.218	0.218

Sugar beet dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21 File: 1927bw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
neg control	2.168				
0.000199	2.168	0.636		1.68	k = 1, v = 48
0.000399	2.168	0.636		1.76	k= 2, v=48
0.000797	1.881	2.579	*	1.79	k = 3, v = 48
0.00156	1.360	8.402	*	1.80	k = 4, v = 48
0.00311	0.630	16.574	*	1.80	k = 5, v = 48
0.00622	0.218	20.463	*	1.81	k = 6, v = 48

s = 0.179

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

Estimates of EC%

 Parameter
 Estimate
 95% Bounds
 Std.Err.
 Lower Bound /Estimate

 Lower
 Upper
 /Estimate

 EC5
 0.00049
 0.00037
 0.00065
 0.061
 0.75

 EC10
 0.00067
 0.00052
 0.00085
 0.053
 0.78

 EC25
 0.0011
 0.00094
 0.0013
 0.039
 0.84

 EC50
 0.0020
 0.0018
 0.0022
 0.025
 0.89

Slope = 2.68 Std.Err. = 0.183

### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

## **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

Goodness of fit: p =	0.74	based on DF=	4.0	48.
1927BW : Sugar beet dry	weight	(g), 1bs ai/A;	Day 21	

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change	
0.00	8.00	2.11	2.19	-0.0805	100.	0.00	
0.000199	8.00	2.21	2.18	0.0249	99.6	0.360	
0.000399	8.00	2.18	2.13	0.0589	97.0	3.03	
0.000797	8.00	1.88	1.88	0.000602	85.8	14.2	
0.00156	8.00	1.36	1.34	0.0164	61.3	38.7	
0.00311	8.00	0.630	0.664	-0.0335	30.3	69.7	
0.00622	7.00	0.218	0.203	0.0152	9.27	90.7	

Sugar beet % survival, 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927bs Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANOVA BY RANKS - TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	RANK SUM
1	neg control	100.000	100.000	252.000
2	0.000199	100.000	100.000	252.000
3	0.000399	100.000	100.000	252.000
4	0.000797	100.000	100.000	252.000
5	0.00156	100.000	100.000	252.000
6	0.00311	100.000	100.000	252.000
7	0.00622	55.000	55.000	84.000

Sugar beet % survival, 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927bs Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

DUNNS MULTIPLE COMPARISON - KRUSKAL-WALLIS - TABLE 2 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ORIGINAL MEAN	-	0	0	0	-	0					-
				-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
7	0.00622	55.000	55.000	- \										
. 2	0.000199	1,00.000	100.000		\									
3	0.000399	100.000	100.000			\								
4	0.000797	100.000	100.000				1							
5	0.00156	100.000	100.000					\						
6	0.00311	100.000	100.000	٠.					١					
1	neg control	100.000	100.000		•					\				

<sup>\* =</sup> significant difference (p=0.05) . = no significant difference Table q value (0.05,7) = 3.038 SE = 8.295

Sunflower dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

**EPA MRID Number 468019-27** 

File: 1927fw

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

KRUS	KAL	-W₽	الملطا	Si.	$\Delta$ NO	VΑ	ΒX	K.	AMK	· ~	- '	TAB	ظل	Т.	OF.	4		
 																	 	 -

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	RANK SUM
1	neg control	1.243	1.243	432.000
2	0.000199	1.273	1.273	477.500
3	0.000399	1.247	1.247	430.000
4	0.000797	1.238	1.238	442.000
5	0.00156	1.222	1.222	419.500
6	0.00311	0.866	0.866	229.000
7	0.00622	0.251	0.251	55.000

Calculated H Value = 34.836 Critical H Value Table = 12.590 Since Calc H > Crit H REJECT Ho:All groups are equal.

Sunflower dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927fw Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

DUNNS MULTIPLE COMPARISON - KRUSKAL-WALLIS - TABLE 2 OF 2

						GI	ROT	JΡ						
		TRANSFORMED	ORIGINAL	0	Ö	0	0	0	0	0				
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	MEAN	MEAN	7	6	5	4	1	3	2				
				_	-	_	_	_	-					
7	0.00622	0.251	0.251	$\cdot$										
6	0.00311	0.866	0.866		\									
5	0.00156	1.222	1.222	*		١								
4	0.000797	1.238	1.238	*			\							
1	neg control	1.243	1.243	*				\						
3	0.000399	1.247	1.247	*					À					
2	0.000199	1.273	1.273	*						\				

\* = significant difference (p=0.05) . = no significant difference Table q value (0.05,7) = 3.038 SE = 9.101

Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	.nds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	0.0017	0.0013	0.0023	0.061	0.75	
EC10	0.0021	0.0016	0.0026	0.052	0.79	
EC25	0.0029	0.0024	0.0034	0.037	0.84	
EC50	0.0040	0.0036	0.0045	0.023	0.90	

Slope = 4.47 Std.Err. = 0.549

Goodness of	fit: p =	1.0	based on I	OF=	4.0	63.
1927FW : Sur	flower dry	weight (g	), lbs ai	'A; Day 21	L	
Observed vs.	Predicted	Treatment	Group Mea	ıns		
Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change

#### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

0.00	10.0	1.24	1.25	-0.00980	100.	0.00
0.000199	10.0	1.27	1.25	0.0208	100.	2.58e-07
0.000399	10.0	1.25	1.25	-0.00530	100.	0.000354
0.000797	10.0	1.24	1.25	-0.0138	99.9	0.0821
0.00156	10.0	1.22	1.21	0.0104	96.7	3.25
0.00311	10.0	0.865	0.868	-0.00287	69.3	30.7
0.00622	10.0	0.251	0.251	0.000504	20.0	80.0

Tomato dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANOVA BY RANKS - TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	RANK SUM
-1	neg control	0.751	0.751	414.500
2	0.000199	0.813	0.813	445.000
3	0.000399	1.061	1.061	557.000
4	0.000797	0.743	0.743	454.000
5	0.00156	0.399	0.399	248.000
6	0.00311	0.149	0.149	79.500
7	0.00622	0.268	0.268	148.000

Calculated H Value = 43.342 Critical H Value Table = 12.590 Since Calc H > Crit H REJECT Ho: All groups are equal.

Tomato dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927tw

Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

DUNNS MULTIPLE COMPARISON - KRUSKAL-WALLIS - TABLE 2 OF 2

GROUP TRANSFORMED ORIGINAL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 GROUP IDENTIFICATION MEAN MEAN 6 7 5 4 1 2 3 6 0.00311 0.149 0.149 \
7 0.00622 0.268 0.268 \
5 0.00156 0.399 0.399 \
4 0.000797 0.743 0.743 \* \* \
1 neg control 0.751 0.751 \* \
2 0.000199 0.813 0.813 \* \* \
3 0.000399 1.061 1.061 \* \* \* \

\* = significant difference (p=0.05) . = no significant difference Table q value (0.05,7) = 3.038 Unequal reps - multiple SE values

Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	nds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	0.00023	4.3E-05	0.0012	0.36	0.19	
EC10	0.00037	8.9E-05	0.0015	0.31	0.24	
EC25	0.00081	0.00029	0.0022	0.22	0.36	
EC50	0.0019	0.0010	0.0036	0.14	0.54	

Slope = 1.78 Std.Err. = 0.503

### PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

#### **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

43.6

64.5

81.8

!!!Poor fit: p =	0.0022	based on DF=	4.0	61.	

1927TW: Tomato dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21

Observed vs.	Predicted	Treatment	Group M	eans			
Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change	
0.00	10.0	0.751	0.890	-0.139	100.	0.00	
0.000199	10.0	0.813	0.855	-0.0417	96.1	3.94	
0.000399	10.0	1.06	0.791	0.271	88.8	11.2	
0.000797	10.0	0.743	0.670	0.0733	75.3	24.7	

## 9.00 Tomato % survival, lbs ai/A; Day 21

10.0

9.00

0.00156

0.00311

0.00622

File: 1927ts Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

0.399

0.149

0.268

#### KRUSKAL-WALLIS ANOVA BY RANKS - TABLE 1 OF 2

0.502

0.316

0.162

-0.103

-0.167

0.107

56.4

35.5

18.2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	RANK SUM
1	neg control	100.000	100.000	435.000
2	0.000199	100.000	100.000	435.000
3	0.000399	100.000	100.000	435.000
4	0.000797	100.000	100.000	435.000
5	0.00156	100.000	100.000	435.000
6	0.00311	70.000	70.000	229.000
7	0.00622	45.000	45.000	81.000

Calculated H Value = -39.546Critical H Value Table = 12.590 Since Calc H < Crit H FAIL TO REJECT Ho: All groups are equal.

Tomato % survival, lbs ai/A; Day 21

File: 1927ts Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

DUNNS MULTIPLE COMPARISON - KRUSKAL-WALLIS - TABLE 2 OF 2

						_					 	 
						G	ROI	JΡ				
		TRANSFORMED	ORIGINAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	MEAN	MEAN	7	6	3	4	5	1	2		
				_	-	-	-	_	-	-		
7	0.00622	45.000	45.000	\								
6	0.00311	70.000	70.000		\							
3	0.000399	100.000	100.000	*		\						
4	0.000797	100.000	100.000	*			١					* .
5	0.00156	100.000	100.000	*				١				
1	neg control	100.000	100.000	*					\			
2	0.000199	100.000	100.000	*						\		

<sup>\* =</sup> significant difference (p=0.05) Table q value (0.05,7) = 3.038

Estimates of EC%

<sup>. =</sup> no significant difference SE = 8.740

## PMRA Submission Number 2006-2446

## **EPA MRID Number 468019-27**

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	ınds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	0.0013	0.00069	0.0025	0.14	0.53	
EC10	0.0018	0.0011	0.0030	0.11	0.60	
EC25	0.0030	0.0022	0.0041	0.066	0.74	
EC50	0.0054	0.0045	0.0064	0.038	0.84	

Slope = 2.67 Std.Err. = 0.574

Goodness of fit: p =		based on		 63.
1927TS : Tomato % surviva	l, lbs	ai/A; Da	y 21	

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

	Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change	
	0.00	10.0	100.	101.	-1.12	100.	0.00	
	0.000199	10.0	100.	101.	-1.12	100.	0.00654	
	0.000399	10.0	100.	101.	-0.993	99.9	0.127	
	0.000797	10.0	100.	99.8	0.228	98.7	1.34	
	0.00156	10.0	100.	93.5	6.50	92.5	7.53	
	0.00311	10.0	70.0	74.6	-4.62	73.8	26.2	
	0.00622	10.0	45.0	43.9	1.13	43.4	56.6	

Oilseed Rape EC25 Lower 95% C.I.	kg product/ha 0.038 0.031	<b>g ai/ha</b> 1.7214 1.4043	Ibs ai/A 0.00151 0.00124
Upper 95% C.I.	0.044	1.9932	0.00175
EC50	0.067	3.0351	0.00267
Lower 95% C.I. Upper 95% C.I.	0.059 0.076	2.6727 3.4428	0.00235 0.00303
Soybean			
EC25 Lower 95% C.I.	0.043	1.9479	0.00171
Upper 95% C.I.	0.036 0.049	1.6308 2.2197	0.00144 0.00195
EC50	0.087	3.9411	0.00347
Lower 95% C.I.	0.077	3.4881	0.00307
Upper 95% C.I.	0.099	4.4847	0.00395
Sugar beet			
EC25	0.031	1.4043	0.00124
Lower 95% C.I.	0.028	1.2684	0.00112
Upper 95% C.I.	0.033	1.4949	0.00132
EC50	0.052	2.3556	0.00207
Lower 95% C.I.	0.05	2.265	0.00199
Upper 95% C.I.	0.055	2.4915	0.00219
Sunflower			
EC25	0.073	3.3069	0.00291
Lower 95% C.I. Upper 95% C.I.	0.068 0.077	3.0804	0.00271
Opper 95% C.I.	0.077	3.4881	0.00307
EC50	0.102	4.6206	0.00407
Lower 95% C.I.	0.097	4.3941	0.00387
Upper 95% C.I.	0.107	4.8471	0.00427
Tomato			
EC25	0.027	1.2231	0.00108
Lower 95% C.I. Upper 95% C.I.	ND ND	ND ND	ND
Opper 30 % C.I.	ND	ND	ND
EC50	0.054	2.4462	0.00215
Lower 95% C.I.	ND	ND	ND
Upper 95% C.I.	ND	ND	ND

Corn		i e	
EC25	0.994	45.0282	0.0396
Lower 95% C.I.	0.519	23.5107	0.0207
Upper 95% C.I.	1.313	59.4789	0.0523
EC50	1.742	78.9126	0.0694
Lower 95% C.I.	1.32	59.796	0.0526
Upper 95% C.I.	ND	ND	ND
Oat			
EC25	1.269	57.4857	0.0506
Lower 95% C.I.	1.054	47.7462	0.0420
Upper 95% C.I.	1.472	66.6816	0.0587
Onion			
EC25	0.637	28.8561	0.0254
Lower 95% C.I.	0.119	5.3907	0.00474
Upper 95% C.I.	1.061	48.0633	0.0423
EC50	1.567	70.9851	0.0625
Lower 95% C.I.	0.924	41.8572	0.0368
Upper 95% C.I.	ND	ND	ND

## Corn Dry Weight (g)

	Negative Control	0.00311	0.00622	0.0125
Rep 1	4.641	4.491	3.719	4.140
Rep 2	1.025	4.881	4.105	5.137
Rep 3	3.987	4.231	4.955	4.127
Rep 4	4.708	3.834	4.575	4.262
Rep 5	4.490	3.965	4.072	4.264
Rep 6	4.962	4.382	4.549	4.190
Rep 7	3.907	3.360	4.099	4.578
Rep 8	4.877	3.722	4.821	3.884
Mean	4.075	4.108	4.362	4.323
% Reduction	N/A	-1	<i>-7</i>	-6

0.0249	0.0498	0.0944
4.626	2.150	1.917
3.815	2.978	2.025
4.149	2.633	1.765
4.999	2.351	1.610
3.337	2.281	1.502
3.468	2.584	1.209
4.542	2.918	1.063
5.157	3.128	1.867
4.262	2.628	1.620
<i>-5</i>	36	60

2.15000000 <sup>7</sup> 2.97800000

```
Corn dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
8
8
neg control
4.64100000
1.02500000
3.98700000
4.70800000
4.49000000
4.96200000
3.90700000
4.87700000
0.00311
4.49100000
4.88100000
4.23100000
3.83400000
3.96500000
4.38200000
3.36000000
3.72200000
0.00622
3.71900000
4.10500000
4.95500000
4.57500000
4.07200000
4.54900000
4.09900000
4.82100000
0.0125
4.14000000
5.13700000
4.12700000
4.26200000
4.26400000
4.19000000
4.57800000
3.88400000
0.0249
4.62600000
3.81500000
4.14900000
4.99900000
3.33700000
3.468
4.54200000
5.15700000
0.0498
```

- 2.63300000
- 2.35100000
- 2.28100000
- 2.58400000
- 2.91800000
- 3.12800000
- 0.0944
- 1.91700000
- 2.02500000
- 1.76500000
- 1.61000000
- 1.50200000
- 1.20900000
- 1.06300000
- 1.86700000

## **Cucumber Percent Survival**

Application	Rate (	(lbs	ai/A)
-------------	--------	------	-------

ppiiodiioii i idio (ibo	air r y	# Survived	% Survival	Survival % Red.
Negative Contro	ol			
Rep 1		4	100	
Rep 2		4	100	
Rep 3		4	100	
Rep 4		4	100	
Rep 5		4	100	
Rep 6		4	100	
Rep 7		4	100	
Rep 8	V	4	100	
Rep 9		4	100	
-				
Rep 10		4	100	A 1/A
Mean			100	N/A
0.000199				
Rep 1		4	100	
Rep 2		4	100	
Rep 3		4	100	
Rep 4		4	100	
Rep 5		4	100	
Rep 6		4	100	* .
Rep 7		4	100	·
Rep 8		4	100	
Rep 9		4	100	
Rep 10		4	100	
Mean			100	0
0.000399				
Rep 1		4	100	
Rep 2		4	100	
Rep 3		4	100	
Rep 4		4	100	·
Rep 5		4	100	
Rep 6		4	100	
Rep 7		4	100	
Rep 8		4	100	
Rep 9		4	100	
Rep 10		4		
Mean		4	100 100	j
0.000797			100	0
		4	400	1
Rep 1		4	100	
Rep 2		4	100	
Rep 3		4	100	
Rep 4		4	100	
Rep 5		4	100	
Rep 6		4	100	
Rep 7		4	100	
Rep 8		4	100	
Rep 9		4	100	

Rep 10	4	100	
Mean		100	0
0.00156			
Rep 1	4	100	
Rep 2	4	100	
Rep 3	4	100	
Rep 4	4	100	
Rep 5	4	100	
Rep 6	4	100	
Rep 7	4	100	
Rep 8	4	100	
Rep 9	4	100	
Rep 10	4	100	
Mean		100	0
0.00311			
Rep 1	4	100	
Rep 2	4	100	
Rep 3	4	100	
Rep 4	4	100	
Rep 5	4	100	
Rep 6	4	100	
Rep 7	4	100	
Rep 8	4	100	
Rep 9	4	100	
Rep 10	4	100	
Mean		100	0
0.00622			
Rep 1	4	100	
Rep 2	4	100	
Rep 3	4	100	
Rep 4	4	100	
Rep 5	4	100	
Rep 6	4	100	
Rep 7	4	100	
Rep 8	4	100	
Rep 9	4	100	
Rep 10	4	100	
Mean		100	0

```
Cucumber dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
neg control
3.654
3.456
3.397
3.276
3.282
2.922
2.106
3.121
3.232
1.467
0.000199
2.952
3.694
3.864
3.439
2.957
3.720
3.808
3.982
2.615
3.490
0.000399
3.683
2.726
3.986
2.197
3.229
3.269
3.577
3.394
3.481
3.031
0.000797
3.364
2.962
2.891
3.154
2.640
3.091
2.899
3.266
2.945
3.253
0.00156
2.329
2.286
```

2.607

2.904

2.107

2.336

2.979

2.243

0.00311 2.199

2.669

2.178

2.087

2.320

2.672

2.838 2.601

2.717

3.091

0.00622

1.082

2.303

1.871

2.093

1.708

2.023

1.393

2.326

1.589

## **Nominal Application Rates**

kg product/ha	g ai/ha	
Negative Control	Negative Control	x 0.0022 lb/g
0.005	0.227	x 0.0022 lb/g
0.010	0.453	x 0.0022 lb/g
0.020	0.906	x 0.0022 lb/g
0.039	1.77	x 0.0022 lb/g
0.078	3.53	x 0.0022 lb/g
0.156	7.07	x 0.0022 lb/g
0.313	14.2	x 0.0022 lb/g
0.625	28.3	x 0.0022 lb/g
1.25	56.6	x 0.0022 lb/g
2.5	113	x 0.0022 lb/g

		lbs ai/A
0	x 0.4 ha/A	0
0.000498	x 0.4 ha/A	0.000199
0.000997	x 0.4 ha/A	0.000399
0.00199	x 0.4 ha/A	0.000797
0.00389	x 0.4 ha/A	0.00156
0.00777	x 0.4 ha/A	0.00311
0.0156	x 0.4 ha/A	0.00622
0.0312	x 0.4 ha/A	0.0125
0.0623	x 0.4 ha/A	0.0249
0.125	x 0.4 ha/A	0.0498
0.249	x 0 4 ha/A	0.0994

## Oat Dry Weight (g)

	Negative Control	0.00622	0.0125	0.0249	0.0498
Rep 1	2.361	2.218	2.224	1.974	2.032
Rep 2	1.720	2.417	2.689	2.189	2.096
Rep 3	2.643	2.353	2.400	1.423	1.568
Rep 4	2.173	2.456	1.775	2.358	1.153
Rep 5	2.637	2.430	2.213	2.590	2.048
Rep 6	2.330	2.280	2.214	1.917	1.724
Rep 7	2.598	2.306	2.123	2.003	1.686
Rep 8	1.952	2.012	1.754	2.149	1.529
Mean	2.302	2.309	2.174	2.075	1.730
% Reduction	N/A	0	6	10	25

1.204

1.190

1.413

1.149

1.433

1.055

1.139

1.647

1.279

44

```
Oat dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
8
neg control
2.361
1.720
2.643
2.173
2.637
2.330
2.598
1.952
0.00622
2.218
2.417
2.353
2.456
2.430
2.280
2.306
2.012
0.0125
2.224
2.689
2.400
1.775
2.213
2.214
2.123
1.754
0.0249
1.974
2.189
1.423
2.358
2.590
1.917
2.003
2.149
0.0498
2.032
2.096
1.568
1.153
2.048
1.724
1.686
1.529
0.0944
1.204
1.190
```

1.433

1.055 1.139 1.647

```
Oilseed rape dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
8
8
neg control
3.70000000
3.07400000
3.71300000
4.24000000
4.09600000
2.91600000
3.93800000
3.90400000
0.000199
3.98200000
1.56300000
3.71900000
4.05500000
3.90100000
4.15400000
3.59200000
4.09300000
0.000399
3.639
3.84400000
3.46300000
3.21900000
3.36800000
3.30700000
3.10700000
3.72900000
0.000797
3.37700000
2.69800000
3.34400000
3.76500000
4.16600000
3.96900000
3.89100000
2.20100000
0.00156
2.22500000
3.45300000
2.81900000
3.00700000
2.90700000
2.67200000
2.88000000
2.37700000
0.00311
1.39900000
```

- 1.68000000
- 1.67000000
- 1.87700000
- 0.69200000
- 1.79100000
- 1.60300000
- 0.00622
- 0.83000000
- 0.72800000
- 1.24000000
- 0.35400000
- 0.53600000
- 0.29500000
- 0.48700000
- 0.54100000

## Oilsee rape Percent Emergence and Survival

Application Hate (lbs al/A)			
	# Survived	% Survival	Survival % Red.
Negative Control			•
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	,
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean	, i	100	N/A
0.000199		100	74/71
Rep 1		100	1
	5		
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean	•	100	<b>.</b>
0.000399			
Rep 1	5	100	1
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	,
Rep 5	5	100	the state of the s
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	<b>]</b> .
Mean		100	0
0.000797			_
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	<u> </u>
Rep 3	5	100	· ·
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	,
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean	· ·	100	1
0.00156		100	0
	, I	100	1 .
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5 5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	, '

5	100	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	100	
5	100	
•	100	0
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
	100	0
5	100	
3	60	
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
<b>5</b>	100	
5	100	
<b>5</b> 4	100	
	95	5
	55 5555555 5755555	5     100       5     100

## **Onion Percent Survival**

Application	Rate	(lbs	ai/A)

opilication rate (ibs air-i)	# Survived	% Survival	Survival % Red.
Negative Control			
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	. 5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	Į.
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean	_	100	N/A
0.00311		.40	
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	*
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	· [
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
	5 5		
Rep 8	5	100	_
Mean		100	0
0.00622	-	100	•
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	*
Rep 5	` <u>5</u>	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	0
0.0125			
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	. 5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	_ o
0.0249			_
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	<b>. 5</b>	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	'

Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	0
0.0498			
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	0
0.0994		·	
Rep 1	3	60	
Rep 2	0	0	
Rep 3	0	0	
Rep 4	2	40	
Rep 5	1	20	
Rep 6	0	0	
Rep 7	3	60	
Rep 8	1	20	
Mean		25	<i>75</i>

```
Onion % survival, lbs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
8
neg control
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.00311
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.00622
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.0125
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.0249
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.0498
100
```

```
Onion dry weight (g), lbs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
7
neg control
0.048
0.053
0.049
0.074
0.055
0.043
0.043
0.037
0.00311
0.064
0.058
0.072
0.058
0.050
0.049
0.091
0.091
0.00622
0.093
0.058
0.053
0.062
0.053
0.045
0.043
0.052
0.0125
0.038
0.091
0.035
0.045
0.050
0.054
0.048
0.043
0.0249
0.031
0.034
0.029
0.036
0.023
0.039
0.032
0.043
0.0498
0.024
```

0.042 0.031

0.017

0.021

0.0944

0.023

0.022

0.029

0.020

#### Ryegrass Percent Survival

Application	Rate (	lbs	ai/A)

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		# Sı	urvived	% Survival	Survival % Red.
<b>Negative Contro</b>	I				
Rep 1			5	100	<b>.</b>
Rep 2			5	100	•
Rep 3			5	100	
Rep 4			5	100	
Rep 5			5	100	
Rep 6			5	100	·
Rep 7			5	100	*
Rep 8			5	100	
Mean				100	N/A
0.00622					
Rep 1			5	100	Ī
Rep 2			5	100	
Rep 3			5	100	
Rep 4			5	100	
Rep 5			5	100	
Rep 6			5	100	
Rep 7			5	100	,
Rep 8			5	100	
Mean			•	100	<b>-</b> 0
0.0125					
Rep 1			5	100	
Rep 2			5	100	
Rep 3			5	100	
Rep 4			5	100	•
Rep 5			5	100	
Rep 6			5	100	
Rep 7			5	100	
Rep 8		•	5	100	,
Mean				100	<b>-</b> 0
0.0249					
Rep 1			5	100	7
Rep 2			5	100	
Rep 3			5	100	
Rep 4			5	100	
Rep 5			5	100	
Rep 6			5	100	
Rep 7			5	100	
Rep 8			5	100	
Mean			J	100	0
0.0498				700	
Rep 1			5	100	7
Rep 2			5	100	
Rep 3			5	100	
Rep 4			5	100	İ
Rep 5			5	100	•
i iop o			J	1 100	

5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
· '	100	0
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
<b>5</b> .	100	
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
5	100	
	100	0
	5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	5     100       5     100       100     100       5     100       5     100       5     100       5     100       5     100       5     100       5     100       5     100       5     100       5     100       5     100

```
Ryegrass dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
8
neg control
0.541
0.572
0.555
0.694
0.846
0.500
0.499
0.802
0.00622
0.681
0.883
0.665
0.509
0.767
0.954
0.795
0.668
0.0125
0.762
0.770
0.566
0.629
0.609
0.620
0.650
0.639
0.0249
0.570
0.428
0.599
0.558
0.706
0.560
0.486
0.770
0.0498
0.660
0.930
0.666
0.700
0.750
0.720
0.792
0.793
0.0944
0.495
0.536
```

0.592 0.768 0.514 0.579

# Soybean Percent Emergence and Survival

#### Application Rate (lbs ai/A)

phoduoti i lato (100 ali/i)	# Survived	% Survival	Survival % Red.
<b>Negative Control</b>			
Rep 1	5	100	]
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	. 100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	N/A
0.000199			
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	0
0.000399			
Rep 1	5	100	7
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	<b>-</b> 0
0.000797			
Rep 1	5	100	1
Rep 2	5	100	'
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	100	0
0.00156			
Rep 1	5	100	1
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	1 12
Rep 5	5	100	
*			■ 3 (4.2)

Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	0
0.00311			
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	 5	100	
Rep 4	5	100	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	. 5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		100	0
0.00622			
Rep 1	5	100	
Rep 2	5	100	
Rep 3	5	100	
Rep 4	4	80	
Rep 5	5	100	
Rep 6	5	100	
Rep 7	5	100	
Rep 8	5	100	
Mean		98	3

1.004 0.972

```
Soybean dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
8
8
neg control
1.840
1.926
2.304
2.137
2.104
1.863
2.195
1.852
0.000199
1.727
2.011
2.178
2.233
2.172
2.189
1.867
2.055
0.000399
1.965
2.281
1.997
1.590
2.214
2.039
1.946
1.882
0.000797
1.787
1.815
2.023
1.689
1.728
1.948
2.107
2.176
0.00156
1.524
1.711
1.670
1.353
1.349
1.821
1.552
1.682
0.00311
```

1.120

0.926

1.203 1.111

1.019

0.00622

0.615

0.580

0.447

0.757

0.745 0.513 0.746

### Sugar beet Dry Weight (g)

	Negative Control	0.000199	0.000399	0.000797
Rep 1	2.136	2.156	2.026	1.853
Rep 2	1.882	2.139	1.935	1.606
Rep 3	2.079	2.146	2.259	1.886
Rep 4	2.066	2.242	2.162	2.140
Rep 5	2.266	2.356	2.227	1.804
Rep 6	2.187	2.215	2.229	1.912
Rep 7	1.896	2.199	2.419	1.905
Rep 8	2.377	2.216	2.217	1.939
Mean	2.111	2.209	2.184	1.881
% Reduction	N/A	<i>-5</i>	-3	11

0.00156	0.00311	0.00622
1.176	0.639	0.207
1.828	0.410	0.343
1.192	0.901	0.196
1.253	0.254	0.102
1.251	0.800	0.089
1.240	0.857	0.328
1.129	0.556	
1.814	0.624	0.264
1.360	0.630	0.218
<i>36</i>	<i>70</i>	90

```
Sugar beet % survival, 1bs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
8
8
neg control
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.000199
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.000399
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.000797
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.00156
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.00311
100
```

```
Sugar beet dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21
8
8
8
8
8
8
7
neg control
2.136
1.882
2.079
2.066
2.266
2.187
1.896
2.377
0.000199
2.156
2.139
2.146
2.242
2.356
2.215
2.199
2.216
0.000399
2.026
1.935
2.259
2.162
2.227
2.229
2.419
2.217
0.000797
1.853
1.606
1.886
2.140
1.804
1.912
1.905
1.939
0.00156
1.176
1.828
1.192
1.253
1.251
1.240
1.129
1.814
0.00311
0.639
```

0.254

0.800 0.857

0.556

0.624 0.00622

0.207

0.343

0.196 0.102 0.089

0.328

## Sunflower Dry Weight (g)

	Negative Control	0.000199	0.000399	0.000797
Rep 1	0.965	1.113	1.208	0.834
Rep 2	1.627	1.278	1.067	1.499
Rep 3	1.608	1.242	1.367	1.606
Rep 4	1.195	1.318	0.812	1.271
Rep 5	1.077	1.303	1.192	1.356
Rep 6	1.269	1.241	1.297	1.151
Rep 7	0.939	1.275	1.222	0.822
Rep 8	1.012	1.323	1.613	1.137
Rep 9	1.385	1.303	1.668	1.246
Rep 10	1.349	1.336	1.025	1.454
Mean	1.243	1.273	1.247	1.238
% Reduction	N/A	-2	0	0

0.00156	0.00311	0.00622
1.322	0.860	0.221
0.796	0.594	0.223
1.449	1.210	0.246
1.097	0.829	0.238
1.172	0.714	0.379
1.241	0.709	0.375
1.179	0.485	0.203
1.453	0.779	0.197
1.503	1.199	0.142
1.009	1.276	0.296
1.222	0.866	0.252
2	30	80

```
Sunflower dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
neg control
0.965
1.627
1.608
1.195
1.077
1.269
0.939
1.012
1.385
1.349
0.000199
1.113
1.278
1.242
1.318
1.303
1.241
1.275
1.323
1.303
1.336
0.000399
1.208
1.067
1.367
0.812
1.192
1.297
1.222
1.613
1.668
1.025
0.000797
0.834
1.499
1.606
1.271
1.356
1.151
0.822
1.137
1.246
1.454
0.00156
1.322
0.796
```

1.172

1.241

1.179

1.453

1.503

1.009

0.00311

0.860

0.594

1.210

0.829

0.714

0.709

0.485

0.779

1.199

4 - 4 - - -

1.276

0.00622

0.221

0.223

0.246

0.238

0.374

0.375

0.203

0.197

0.142

#### **Tomato Percent Survival**

Application Rate (lbs ai/A)
-----------------------------

ophoduon nato (150 distry	# Survived	% Survival	Survival % Red.
<b>Negative Control</b>			
Rep 1	4	100	•
Rep 2	4	100	
Rep 3	4	100	
Rep 4	4	100	
Rep 5	4	100	
Rep 6	4	100	*.
Rep 7	4	100	
Rep 8	4	100	
Rep 9	4	100	
Rep 10	4	100	
Mean	7	100	IJ N/A
0.000199		. 100	IWA
		100	<b>–</b>
Rep 1	4	100	
Rep 2	4	100	
Rep 3	4	100	
Rep 4	4	100	
Rep 5	4	100	
Rep 6	4	100	
Rep 7	4	100	
Rep 8	4	100	
Rep 9	4	100	•
Rep 10	. 4	100	
Mean		100	<i>o</i>
0.000399			
Rep 1	4	100	
Rep 2	4	100	
Rep 3	4	100	
Rep 4	. 4	100	
Rep 5	4	100	
Rep 6	4	100	
Rep 7	4	100	
Rep 8	4	100	
Rep 9	4	100	
Rep 10	4	100	
Mean	•	100	<b>-</b> 0
0.000797		700	V
Rep 1	4	100	
Rep 2	4	100	
Rep 3	4	100	÷
Rep 4	4		
-		100	
Rep 5	4	100	
Rep 6	4	100	, comp. (2-1)
Rep 7	4	100	
Rep 8	4	100	1
Rep 9	4	100	

Rep 10	4	100	
Mean		100	0
0.00156			
Rep 1	4	100	
Rep 2	4	100	
Rep 3	4	100	
Rep 4	4	100	
Rep 5	4	100	
Rep 6	4	100	
Rep 7	4	100	
Rep 8	4	100	
Rep 9	4	100	
Rep 10	4	100	
Mean		100	Ö
0.00311			
Rep 1	2	50	
Rep 2	2 3	75	
Rep 3	2	50	
Rep 4	2 0	0	
Rep 5	2	50	
Rep 6	4	100	
Rep 7	3	75	
Rep 8	4	100	
Rep 9	4	100	
Rep 10	4	100	
Mean		70	30
0.00622			
Rep 1	2	50	
Rep 2	2 3 3	50	
Rep 3	3	75	
Rep 4		75	
Rep 5	0	- 0	
Rep 6	1	25	
Rep 7	2	50	
Rep 8	. 1	25	
Rep 9	1	25	
Rep 10	3	75	
Mean		45	55

```
Tomato % survival, lbs ai/A; Day 21
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
neg control
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.000199
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.000399
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.000797
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
100
0.00156
100
100
```

```
Tomato dry weight (g), 1bs ai/A; Day 21
10
10
10
10
10
9
9
neg control
0.818
0.565
0.567
0.587
0.630
0.468
0.843
2.039
0.257
0.733
0.000199
1.108
0.440
0.683
0.377
0.352
0.877
1.841
1.002
0.681
0.770
0.000399
1.152
1.079
1.719
1.424
0.956
0.698
0.824
1.440
0.640
0.680
0.000797
0.501
0.460
0.663
0.885
0.483
0.980
1.041
0.747
1.033
0.636
0.00156
0.453
0.378
```

0.570

0.503

0.396

0.207

0.106

0.416 0.00311

0.207

0.103

0.132

0.135

0.099

0.093

0.132

0.202

0.236

0.00622

0.130

0.020

0.115

0.136

0.709

0.192

0.400

0.318